

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.

*Archive
Collection*



* This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days *

By Henry Cabot Lodge

SPEECHES AND ADDRESSES. 8vo, \$2.50 *net*.
Postage extra.

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL ESSAYS. Crown
8vo, \$1.25.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON. In American Statesmen Series. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.25; half morocco, \$2.50.

DANIEL WEBSTER. In American Statesmen Series. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.25; half morocco, \$2.50.

STUDIES IN HISTORY. Crown 8vo, \$1.50.

GEORGE WASHINGTON. In American Statesmen Series. 2 vols. 16mo, gilt top, \$2.50; half morocco, \$5.00.

BALLADS AND LYRICS. Edited by HENRY CABOT LODGE. *Holiday Edition.* With twenty-four full-page illustrations. 8vo, full gilt, \$2.50.

The Same. 16mo, \$1.00, *net*.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

SPEECHES AND ADDRESSES

1884-1909

SPEECHES AND ADDRESSES

1884-1909

BY

HENRY CABOT LODGE



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge
1909

COPYRIGHT, 1892 AND 1909, BY HENRY CABOT LODGE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published November 1909

NOTE TO THE SECOND EDITION

THE first edition of this volume has been long out of print. This new edition contains selections from speeches delivered since 1892, when the first edition was published. All the speeches or extracts from speeches are given exactly as they were reported and printed, and therefore deal with facts, conditions, and public affairs as they were at the time of the delivery of each speech, and not as they are to-day. My only reason for this publication is given in the brief note of explanation and dedication prefixed to the first edition.

From many words which passed with the hour of speech, I save these few, because I am glad to have spoken them, and because there are friends of mine who are kind enough to wish to keep them. For myself, I take the pleasure of inscribing them to my friend Theodore Roosevelt, in token of personal affection, and of admiration for his work as a historian and for his services as a public man.

NAHANT, 1892.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS	1
December 22, 1884.	
THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE.	11
March 23, 1886.	
THE BLUE AND THE GRAY.	25
June 17, 1887.	
THE PURITANS	31
December 22, 1887.	
HARVARD COLLEGE IN POLITICS	37
November 22, 1888.	
THE DAY WE CELEBRATE	41
December 21, 1888.	
INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT	49
May 2, 1890.	
THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL. A REPLY . . .	57
January 13, 1890.	
MASSACHUSETTS	65
October 23, 1891.	
FREE COINAGE OF SILVER	71
March 23, 1892.	
THE TARIFF	85
April 10, 1894.	
OUR DUTY TOWARD HAWAII	155
January 19 and 22, 1895.	
NAVAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES	179
March 2, 1895.	
THE MONROE DOCTRINE	195
December 30, 1895.	
THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.	243
March 16, 1896.	

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS	267
March 27, 1896.	
SPEECH AT THE ALUMNI DINNER, HARVARD COMMENCEMENT	289
June, 1896.	
INTERVENTION IN CUBA	295
April 13, 1898.	
THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS	315
March 7, 1900.	
SPEECH AT CANTON, OHIO, NOTIFYING PRESIDENT MCKINLEY OF HIS SECOND NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY . . .	375
July 12, 1900.	
SPEECH AT THE INAUGURATION OF HENRY S. PRITCHETT AS PRESIDENT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECH- NOLOGY	383
October 24, 1900.	
SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS	391
April 10, 1908.	
SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION AT CHICAGO	405
June 17, 1908.	
WILLIAM B. ALLISON	417
February 6, 1909.	
ABRAHAM LINCOLN	431
February 12, 1909.	
NEW ENGLAND AND THE TARIFF	451
June 19, 1909.	

THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE
PURITANS

IN ANSWER TO A TOAST AT THE DINNER OF THE NEW
ENGLAND SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
DECEMBER 22, 1884

THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS

It is no slight trial for a Massachusetts man, especially for one of the younger generation, to be called upon to speak in this presence, where Choate and Webster spoke in bygone days and where the melodious echoes of their eloquence ever seem to linger. The shy and retiring disposition so characteristic of the sons of New England, and which so often hinders their worldly success, becomes at such a moment really oppressive. I can only escape from it by reflecting that this is one of the rare occasions when it is fair that we should all throw aside the native modesty of our race and utter boldly the favorable opinions which we really entertain in regard to the Puritans and their descendants.

For more than three quarters of a century your society has gathered here in the metropolis of the nation to commemorate the founding of that little group of commonwealths known as New England. The best thing we can say of that event is that it is one of the great facts in human progress which really deserves to be freshly remembered. We are honestly and frankly proud to be the descendants of men who placed upon the roadside of history such a milestone as Plymouth Rock. Yet behind this pride there is a gentler but even stronger feeling, gentler

4 THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS

because it springs from love of home, stronger because its roots are entwined among our heart-strings.

The lands to which Nature has been most prodigal are by no means those which are dearest to their children. New England has a harsh climate, a barren soil, a rough and stormy coast, and yet we love it, even with a love passing that of dwellers in more favored regions. Nature, niggard in material gifts, has yet been gracious there in all that appeals to the eye or touches the heart, and we love the Puritan land for mountain and river, for hillside and valley, for rugged cliffs and high sand-dunes, with the measureless sea ever murmuring beneath. Beyond all and above all, we love New England for what is there enshrined: the graves of her honored dead; the hallowed spots where great deeds were wrought; the memories of the men who gave their labors and their lives to the service of their country and mankind.

The independent spirit of New England! That was a chief quality of the Puritans, and the day we celebrate marks the opening of the long struggle of our people for independence of foreign control and foreign influence. The beginning was made in a period of intense religious ferment, and bore the scars of the time. Pilgrim and Puritan alike sought freedom to worship God, but it was freedom for themselves that they might worship God in their own fashion, in this new world, and not at all freedom of worship for any one who chanced that way with different opinions as to creeds and tenets. Independence, unfortunately, is not always synonymous with a generous breadth and just liberality of opinion; at least it was not in the seventeenth century. The Puritan set up his independent church, and then made every one come into it on pain of death or banishment,—punishments

which he inflicted upon all recalcitrants with characteristic vigor and promptness. Yet whatever we may think of his methods, he achieved his religious independence, and his church was his own, and not that of some one else across the water.

That same Puritan spirit of hostility to foreign control and foreign influence has traveled far and fast since then. Its path has lain across the battlefields of the Revolution and over the bloody decks of fighting frigates in the war of 1812, but its mission and its work have ever been the same. The last vestiges of foreign influence upon our habits of thought seemed to vanish in the battle smoke of the civil war, which destroyed our previous morbid sensibility to foreign opinion, and left us

"Self-school'd, self-scann'd, self-honored, self-secure."

Yet although much was then accomplished, all was not done. The imitative colonial propensity of mind still dwells with us. There is still work for the Puritan spirit which would go its own way and think its own thoughts. It is not altogether our own church, even now in the world of ideas; in art, and literature, and among certain elements of our society. Who, for instance, has not heard the profound saying that in this country nature does not lend itself to art? Have we not, then, the glories of morning and of evening, the mists of dawn, the radiance of midday, "the lightning of the noontide ocean," the infinite beauties of sea and sky, of river and mountain? When nature does not lend itself to art it is because there is no art able to borrow. Let the right men come in the right spirit and they will have no trouble with nature.

Thanks to the ever-increasing number of goodly workers, the spirit of dependence on foreign ideas is fast dis-

6 THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS

appearing from our literature. Yet I took up an Anglo-American or "International" volume the other day, and the burden of the first few pages seemed to be that one could not sketch Fifty-third Street. That is, indeed, a most appalling thought. But, after all, who wants to sketch Fifty-third Street? We know it is not as picturesque as the Grand Canal of Venice, and we also know that these things are but trappings in literature. The conditions of French or English life are not ours, and are false for us. Our literature must accept, and is accepting in the right spirit, our own conditions, and it will find, as indeed it has found, the best inspiration at the true source, ever old and ever new, — the wellspring of human passion and human emotion, as full of life here to-day as when Homer sang of Helen's beauty and Achilles' wrath.

Most of all, however, do we need the Puritan spirit in certain elements of our society. The number of men to whom inherited fortune brings education and command of time without effort on their part is ever increasing. Do they avail themselves fully of their opportunities, or are they too apt to pass their days in a vain search for distractions and a mournful regret that this country is not some other country? I am happy to believe that this is the very worst country in the world for an idler. But to the man with health, wealth, education, and unlimited command of time, — in other words, to the man who owes most to his country, — here are better opportunities and higher duties than anywhere else. I am not going to make the familiar plea that young men of education and wealth ought to perform their obvious duties as citizens. There has been plenty of sound argument and good advice offered on that score, and the proposition is well understood.

But this is not all. In this question lie deeper meanings. There is a very real danger that the growth of wealth here may end by producing a class grounded on mere money, and thence class feeling, a thing noxious, deadly, and utterly wrong in this country. It lies with the men of whom I have spoken to strangle this serpent at its birth. They cannot do this, however, unless they are in full sympathy with the American people and with American ideas; and to this sympathy they can never come by living in Europe, by mimicking foreign habits, by haunting well-appointed clubs, or by studying our public affairs in the columns of a Saturday Review, home-made or imported. They must go to work. Philanthropy and public affairs need such men, because they can give what others cannot spare — time and money. There is a great field in politics. Before they enter in, let them take to themselves not only the high and self-respecting spirit of the Puritan, but also his fighting qualities, his dogged persistence, and another attribute for which he was not so conspicuous, — plenty of good nature. They will need all these weapons, for it is no primrose path. They must be prepared to meet not only the usual abuse, but also much and serious prejudice. They must not mind defeats and hard work. If their conception of duty differs from that of their accustomed friends and allies, they must not be surprised if some of those very friends mete out to them the harshest measure and deal them the sharpest blows.

Yet if they hold fast to two principles, — I care not under what party banner they serve, — if they will fearlessly do what in their own eyes and before their own conscience is right and brave and honorable, if, like the Puritans, they will do the work which comes to their hands

8 THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS

with all their might, they will win the best success. They will win the regard and confidence of large bodies of their fellow-citizens, of those men by whose strong hands and active brains the republic is ever being raised higher, and this regard and confidence are the best and most valuable possessions that any American can ever hope to have. Let such men, then, go into politics, because they can give their time and energy to it, because they can do work worth doing, and, above all, because they will thus become truer and better Americans.

I believe, Mr. President, that I am coming very close to what is called "Americanism," but of "Americanism" of the right sort we cannot have too much. Mere vamping and boasting become a nation as little as a man. But honest, outspoken pride and faith in our country are infinitely better and more to be respected than the cultivated reserve which sets it down as ill-bred and in bad taste ever to refer to our country except by way of depreciation, criticism, or general negation. The Puritans did great work in the world because they believed most fervently in their cause, their country, and themselves. It is the same to-day. Without belief of this sort nothing worth doing is ever done.

We have a right to be proud of our vast material success, our national power and dignity, our advancing civilization, carrying freedom and education in its train. Most of all may we be proud of the magnanimity displayed by the American people at the close of the civil war, a noble generosity unparalleled in the history of nations. But to count our wealth and tell our numbers and rehearse our great deeds simply to boast of them is useless enough. We have a right to do it only when we listen to the solemn undertone which brings the message of great

responsibilities, — responsibilities far greater than the ordinary political and financial issues which are sure to find, sooner or later, a right settlement. Social questions are the questions of the present and the future for the American people. The race for wealth has opened a broad gap between rich and poor. There are thousands at your gates toiling from sunrise to sunset to keep body and soul together, and the struggle is a hard and bitter one. The idle, the worthless, and the criminal form but a small element of the community ; but there is a vast body of honest, God-fearing working men and women whose yoke is not easy and whose burden is far from light.

The destiny of the republic is in the welfare of its working men and women. We cannot push their troubles and cares into the background, and trust that all will come right in the end. Let us look to it that differences and inequalities of condition do not widen into ruin. It is most true that these differences cannot be rooted out, but they can be modified, and a great deal can be done to secure to every man the share of well-being and happiness to which his honesty, thrift, and ability entitle him. Legislation cannot change humanity nor alter the decrees of nature, but it can help the solution of these grave problems.

Practical measures are plentiful enough : the hours of labor ; emigration from our over-crowded cities to the lands of the West ; economical and energetic municipal governments ; proper building laws ; the rigid prevention of adulteration in the great staples of food ; wise regulation of the railroads and other great corporations ; the extirpation of race and class in politics ; above all, every effort to secure to labor its fair and full share of the profits earned by the combination of labor and capital. Here

10 THE INDEPENDENT SPIRIT OF THE PURITANS

are matters of great pith and moment, more important, more essential, more pressing, than any others. They must be met; they cannot be shirked or evaded.

The past is across the water; the future is here in our keeping. We can do all that can be done to solve the social problems and fulfill the hopes of mankind. Failure would be a disaster unequalled in history. The first step to success is pride of country, simple, honest, frank, and ever present, and this is the Americanism that I would have. If we have this pride and faith we shall appreciate our mighty responsibilities. Then if we live up to them we shall keep the words "an American citizen" what they now are, — the noblest title any man can bear.

THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
LEISURE

AN ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF HARVARD COLLEGE,
MARCH 23, 1886

THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

I REMEMBER hearing Mr. Lowell say in his most charming way, some years since, of his friend Edmund Quincy, that "early in life Mr. Quincy devoted himself to the arduous profession of gentleman, and certainly in the practice of it he achieved as great success as is possible in a country where we have business in the blood, and where leisure is looked down upon as the larceny of time that belongs to other people." The theory of life in vogue in the United States, and especially in New England, when Mr. Quincy was young, and, indeed, until within a few years, was in some ways a very peculiar one. It was firmly believed that any young man who did not have some regular occupation involving money-getting was doomed to perdition. Literature was barely tolerated; the learned professions, of course, passed muster; but business was much preferred. Any one who did not conform his life to the habits of a trading community was assumed to be totally idle, and in consequence thereof to be drawing his amusement from the source pointed out by Dr. Watts. What a fine refutation to this doctrine is the life of Mr. Quincy himself! A graceful writer of some very charming stories with the perfume of the eighteenth century sweet upon them, the author of one of the very best of American biographies, he holds a secure and hon-

14 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

orable place in our literature. An early Abolitionist, he put his name, his talents, and his character at the service of a despised cause, and never in the hour of its triumph asked or wished reward. By his brilliant correspondence in the New York "Tribune," covering many years, and by his witty and effective speech, he helped to fight the anti-slavery battle. No account of our literature is complete without him, and no history of the great movement which resulted in the abolition of slavery can be written without ample mention of his name and services. The busy money-getters, the worthy citizens who shrugged their shoulders and disapproved him and his ways, are forgotten, but the gentleman of leisure is remembered, and holds an honorable place in the literature and the history of his country. It is a noble record of well-doing, one that any man might be content to leave as a heritage to his children. What, then, was the secret? He used his leisure, that was all. Leisure well employed is of high worth. Leisure unemployed is mere idleness and helpless drifting along the stream of life. The disapprobation of men of leisure which was common in New England in Mr. Quincy's youth erred only because it was narrow, and could not believe that a man was usefully employed unless he worked in a few well-recognized and accepted ways.

It is easy enough to show the error of the old doctrine, and yet it would be quite as great an error to condemn it. Like most Puritan theories, it has at bottom a sound and vital principle, and the danger to-day of forgetting that underlying principle of action is far greater than of our being warped by its too rigid application. A mere idler is a very poor creature. Leisure is nothing in itself. It is only an opportunity, and, like other opportunities, if wasted or abused, it is harmful and often fatal.

The increase of wealth in this country and the multiplication of great fortunes has produced a corresponding increase in the number of young men who, fortunately or unfortunately, are in fact or in prospect the heirs of large estates. Money in itself is worthless, and gets value only through its purchasing power. When its real purpose is misunderstood it is a perilous possession, and the stern necessity of earning a living has proved a strong safeguard and help to many men. Given the command of time and of one's own life, and there is nothing so easy as to let the years slip by in indecision and infirmity of purpose until it is too late. The worst outcome, of course, is when a man uses his great opportunity for nothing but selfish and sensual gratification, with no result but evil to himself and to others. Far better than this cumberer of the ground is the man who, if he does not use his intellectual powers, at least employs his physical gifts in some way. A taste, an amusement, a pursuit of any kind, even if only for amusement's sake, is infinitely better than nothing, or than mere sensual enjoyment. It is manly and wholesome to ride boldly and well, to be a good shot, a successful yachtsman, an intelligent and enterprising traveler. These things are good in themselves, and it may be fairly said that the bold rider, the good shot, the skillful seaman, if he loves these sports for their own sake, has in him, in all probability, the stuff of which a soldier or sailor may be made in the hour of the country's need.

Then, again, there are the men of leisure who devote themselves to some intellectual pursuit, but without any idea of earning money or of any practical result. Such men sometimes do valuable work, but they nevertheless remain amateurs all their lives. They may be credited

16 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

with an honest effort for something better than idleness or physical amusement, sometimes with fruitful work, but there the commendation ceases. The first thing for a man of leisure to do, who really wishes to count in his day and generation, is to avoid being an amateur. In other words, the first thing necessary is to acquire the habit of real work, and this can be done well only by working to obtain money, reputation, or some other solid value. You can only find out if your work is really worth doing, is in truth current gold, by bringing it to the touchstone of competition and an open market.

The essential thing at the start is the habit of thinking and working. The subject of work or thought is not essential, for, the habit once obtained, a man will soon find that for which he is best fitted. Even at this very first step we are likely to be met with objections, and perhaps it is as well to clear them from the path at once.

There is one theory which says that life at best is short and evil; that we are not responsible for it, and that as at our utmost we can effect so little, the correct course is to get as much pleasure out of existence as possible. Accepting this statement, the next proposition is that work or labor is an evil, and should be dispensed with. There is a conclusive answer to this doctrine, even if we take pleasure only as a test, for there is no man so discontented as the idle man, and unless he is witless, the older he grows the more bitter and unhappy he becomes. The only charm of a holiday comes from working before and after it. Your idle man has no holidays; nothing but "the set gray life and apathetic end." It is not easy at the outset to labor with no taskmaster except one's own determination, but the effort grows steadily and rapidly less, so that in a very short time work becomes a necessity, and

brings more solid and lasting pleasure and more interest than anything else human ingenuity can devise for our diversion.

The next question is as to the particular work to which a man of leisure can best devote his time and his energies. I have known men who, without any spur from necessity, have addressed themselves to the professions or to business, and have earned there both money and distinction. It is needless to say that these men deserve the very highest credit and the entire respect of all who know them. At the same time, while we may not criticise such men, it is impossible to doubt that they might be more effective in other fields than those which are primarily and essentially money getting.

It is better for the man of leisure in learning to work and think, or when he has acquired that most precious education, to turn to the fields where men are needed who can labor, without pecuniary profit, for the public benefit. This is not only proper abstractly, but it is a duty and an obligation. Every gentleman pays his debts just as he tells the truth and keeps faith. We all owe a debt to our country, and none so large a debt as the man of leisure. That those who have gone before him have been enabled to accumulate property and leave it to him in secure enjoyment, is due to the wise laws and solid institutions of his State and country, and to the sound and honest character of the American people. That we have a country at all is due to those who fought for her. To them we owe a debt we can only try to pay by devotion to the country that we enjoy, and which they saved.

The modes of working for the public are many. The first which suggests itself is literature, but there, as everywhere else, the essential preliminary is to learn to work

18 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

practically. No man ought to begin by publishing at his own expense. It is far better to try at the doors of the newspapers, the magazines, or the publishers, until you can command a market for your writings, for the only sure way to make a writer that I know is to have him enter the field of competition. When he can hold his own with other men, then it will be time to publish, if he chooses, at his own expense, work of value to the world, but which the world could get in no other way.

There is a still larger opportunity in the directions of public education and public charities. In all these there is a vast and growing demand for intelligent work, and for the most part it is only possible to men who can command their own time. A man can win wide reputation in these departments, and render incalculable service to his fellow-men.

It only remains now to speak of politics. Let every man give of his leisure, be it more or less, to politics ; for it is simply good citizenship to do so. Discard at the outset the wretched habit which is far too prevalent in this country, and particularly, I am sorry to say, among highly educated persons, of regarding all men who are much in politics with suspicion, and of using the word "politician" as an uncomplimentary epithet, and usually with a sneer. You neither help nor hurt the politician by so doing, but you hurt your country and lower her reputation. There is nothing, indeed, which does more to injure politics and the public business than to assume that a man who enters them is in some way lowered by so doing. The calling ought to be and is an honorable one, and we should all seek to honor and elevate, not to decry it. Politics is a wide field, but it is a very practical one, and the amateur is not only singularly out of place there,

but is especially apt to do harm by mistaken efforts to do good. Take hold of politics as you would of any other business, honorably and respectably, but take hold hard. Go to the polls, for example, and work for the man whom you want to see elected, and get your friends to do the same. If you prefer to reach political questions by voice or pen, do it in these ways, but let me suggest that you first inform yourself about politics and politicians, for politics and public questions are exceedingly difficult, and educated men are sometimes as marvelously ignorant upon these subjects as they are ready in judgment and condemnation concerning them.

There is only one other point that I will touch upon as to politics. Work for the highest and best measures always. When the question is between right and wrong, work for what you believe to be right without yielding a jot. In such questions no compromise is possible. Fortunately for us, however, great moral questions like slavery are extremely rare in politics. Most public questions, grave and important as many of them are, are not moral questions at all, and form no part of the everlasting conflict between good and evil, between right and wrong. Do not fall into the cant of treating public questions as moral questions when they are not so. There is a temptation to a certain class of minds to do this, because, the morality of the question being granted and they being in the right themselves, it is then possible to look down upon their opponents and call their enemies wicked. This is cant of the worst kind. All cant and hypocrisy are mean and noxious, and none more so than the political varieties.

Stand for the right, then, against the wrong always, but where there is no moral question involved do not, by

20 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

insisting on the unattainable, lose everything. Because, for example, the civil service act of 1883 falls far short of perfection and completeness, should we therefore reject it? That would be folly. Let us take it as a first great step toward our goal of removing routine offices from politics. The political history of the English-speaking race is in truth a history of legislative compromises. When compromises have not been made with wrong, they have been the stepping stones in the great march of our civilization. They mark the line between the people who are ever moving forward to higher things and those who, insisting on the highest at once, never advance, but stand shrieking with helpless confusion, always in one place.

I have touched very cursorily and unsatisfactorily on some of the fields of public usefulness open to men whose time is wholly at their own disposal, and open in some measure to others as well. In conclusion, I want to say a word on two points which seem to me of great importance, and which apply to all alike. Be in sympathy with your age and country. It is easier to get out of sympathy with the movements of the time than you think. What every man must work with and understand are the forces about him. If he does not, his usefulness is crippled. To be out of sympathy with your country and with American ideas is a grievous fault, to be shunned at all hazards. If a man fails to respect himself no one will respect him, and if he does not love and honor his country he will deserve nothing but contempt. The most utterly despicable of all things is the Anglomania which prevails in certain quarters. It should be impossible here, for no men who have been brought up beneath the shadows of Memorial Hall, and who have felt the influence that descends from its silent tablets, ought to be anything

but ardent Americans. All I would say is, make your Americanism and your patriotism living and active forces in your daily life.

The other point which I wish to make is in regard to a danger which I think is in some measure peculiar to Harvard. I mean the tendency to be merely negative and critical. This arises, in part at least, from a dread of becoming ridiculous by over-enthusiasm, and from the feeling that it is "in better form" to be exceedingly quiet and reticent. But it will not do to confine one's self in life to the purely critical attitude, for it leads to nothing. It may be able to destroy, it can never create. It frequently makes a man sour, envious, and spiteful; it never makes him helpful, generous, brave, and the doer of great deeds. Moreover, if a man contents himself with criticism and negation, he is likely to become not only narrow and arrogant, but ineffective. To be well balanced and efficient we must see the good as well as the evil in both men and things. It is comparatively easy to stand by and criticise the men who are struggling, for instance, in the stream of politics, but a far better thing is to plunge in yourself and try to do something, and to bring some definite thing to pass. If you attain to nothing more, you will at least be a wiser and better critic, and therefore far more weighty and influential, because more sympathetic and more intelligent.

Let me illustrate once more, by an example, what I mean by positiveness and enthusiasm and by disregard of self and of the weak dread of being ridiculous. You have all, no doubt, read the novels and sketches of Mr. Cable. You know that he is one of the most charming of our younger writers. Mr. Cable has lately turned aside to enter another field, and to do what in him lies to

22 THE USES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEISURE

right what he believed to be a wrong. I suppose that every one who listens to me has read the two essays entitled "The Freedman's Case in Equity" and "The Silent South." The modest volume which contains them is, I believe, an epoch-making book. Not now, perhaps, but in the days that are yet to be. These essays are written of course admirably, with literary skill and great force. The words, however, are not so much; the great fact is the man who uttered them. It is the act that will live, and which is destined to mark a stage in our national development. Mr. Cable is the grandson and son of a slaveholder. He was a soldier in the Confederate army. He is a Southerner through and through, with all the traditions and prejudices of the South. He saw before him a despised race just released from slavery; he saw that the condition of that race presented a mighty problem, vital to the welfare of a large part of our common country. He believed that this problem was one which legislation could not reach, but which public opinion in the South could alone deal with. He studied the question, and came to the conclusion that the treatment of the negro was neither right nor honest. How easy it was to remain silent! He had everything to gain and nothing to lose by silence, and he thereupon spoke out. He faced hostility, ostracism almost, at the South, and indifference at the North. He was assailed, abused, and sneered at, but he has never been answered, and he never will be answered until he obtains from the tribunal to which he appealed, from Southern opinion itself, the inevitable verdict that he is right and that the wrong shall be redressed.

It was a great and noble act. It was positive and not negative. Mr. Cable will be remembered for those essays while we have a history, and long after the very names of

those who stood coldly by and criticised him have been forgotten.

It is by such men that the work of the world is done, and every man can do his part, be it great or small, if he rests on the same everlasting principle. The errors, the mistakes, the failures, the ridicule, will be forgotten, but the central, animating thought, manly, robust, and generous, will survive. Be in sympathy with your time and your country. Be positive, not negative. Live the life of your time, if you would live at all. These are generalities, I know, but they mean everything to me because they define a mental and moral attitude which is essential to virility and well doing. Let that attitude be right, and the man upon whom fortune has bestowed the gift of leisure will become, as he ought, one of the most useful and one of the busiest of men. If he is this, the rest will care for itself.

“In light things

Prove thou the arms thou long'st to glorify.

Nor fear to work up from the lowest ranks,

Whence come great nature's captains. And high deeds

Haunt not the fringy edges of the fight,

But the pell-mell of men.”

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

IN ANSWER TO A TOAST AT THE DINNER TO ROBERT
E. LEE CAMP OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS,
IN FANEUIL HALL, JUNE 17, 1887

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

TO such a toast, sir, it would seem perhaps most fitting that one of those should respond who was a part of the great event which it recalls. Yet, after all, on an occasion like this, it may not be amiss to call upon one who belongs to a generation to whom the Rebellion is little more than history, and who, however insufficiently, represents the feelings of that and the succeeding generations as to our great civil war. I was a boy ten years old when the troops marched away to defend Washington, and my personal knowledge of that time is confined to a few broken but vivid memories. I saw the troops, month after month, pour through the streets of Boston. I saw Shaw go forth at the head of his black regiment, and Bartlett, shattered in body but dauntless in soul, ride by to carry what was left of him once more to the battle-fields of the republic. I saw Andrew, standing bare-headed on the steps of the State House, bid the men godspeed. I cannot remember the words he said, but I can never forget the fervid eloquence which brought tears to the eyes and fire to the hearts of all who listened. I understood but dimly the awful meaning of these events. To my boyish mind one thing alone was clear, that the soldiers as they marched past were all, in that supreme hour, heroes and patriots. Amid many changes that simple belief of boyhood has never altered. The gratitude which

I felt then I confess to to-day more strongly than ever. But other feelings have in the progress of time altered much. I have learned, and others of my generation as they came to man's estate have learned, what the war really meant, and they have also learned to know and to do justice to the men who fought the war upon the other side.

I do not stand up in this presence to indulge in any mock sentimentality. You brave men who wore the gray would be the first to hold me or any other son of the North in just contempt if I should say that, now it was all over, I thought the North was wrong and the result of the war a mistake, and that I was prepared to suppress my political opinions. I believe most profoundly that the war on our side was eternally right, that our victory was the salvation of the country, and that the results of the war were of infinite benefit to both North and South. But however we differed, or still differ, as to the causes for which we fought then, we accept them as settled, commit them to history, and fight over them no more. To the men who fought the battles of the Confederacy we hold out our hands freely, frankly, and gladly. To courage and faith wherever shown we bow in homage with uncovered heads. We respect and honor the gallantry and valor of the brave men who fought against us, and who gave their lives and shed their blood in defense of what they believed to be right. We rejoice that the famous general whose name is borne upon your banner was one of the greatest soldiers of modern times, because he, too, was an American. We have no bitter memories to revive, no reproaches to utter. Reconciliation is not to be sought, because it exists already. Differ in politics and in a thousand other ways we must and shall in all

good-nature, but let us never differ with each other on sectional or State lines, by race or creed.

We welcome you, soldiers of Virginia, as others more eloquent than I have said, to New England. We welcome you to old Massachusetts. We welcome you to Boston and to Faneuil Hall. In your presence here, and at the sound of your voices beneath this historic roof, the years roll back and we see the figure and hear again the ringing tones of your great orator, Patrick Henry, declaring to the first Continental Congress, "The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American." A distinguished Frenchman, as he stood among the graves at Arlington, said, "Only a great people is capable of a great civil war." Let us add with thankful hearts that only a great people is capable of a great reconciliation. Side by side, Virginia and Massachusetts led the colonies into the War for Independence. Side by side they founded the government of the United States. Morgan and Greene, Lee and Knox, Moultrie and Prescott, men of the South and men of the North, fought shoulder to shoulder, and wore the same uniform of buff and blue, — the uniform of Washington.

Your presence here brings back their noble memories, it breathes the spirit of concord, and unites with so many other voices in the irrevocable message of union and goodwill. Mere sentiment all this, some may say. But it is sentiment, true sentiment, that has moved the world. Sentiment fought the war, and sentiment has reunited us. When the war closed, it was proposed in the newspapers and elsewhere to give Governor Andrew, who had sacrificed health and strength and property in his public duties, some immediately lucrative office, like the collector-

ship of the port of Boston. A friend asked him if he would take such a place. "No," said he; "I have stood as high priest between the horns of the altar, and I have poured out upon it the best blood of Massachusetts, and I cannot take money for that." Mere sentiment truly, but the sentiment which ennobles and uplifts mankind. It is sentiment which so hallows a bit of torn, stained bunting, that men go gladly to their deaths to save it. So I say that the sentiment manifested by your presence here, brethren of Virginia, sitting side by side with those who wore the blue, has a far-reaching and gracious influence, of more value than many practical things. It tells us that these two grand old commonwealths, parted in the shock of the Civil War, are once more side by side as in the days of the Revolution, never to part again. It tells us that the sons of Virginia and Massachusetts, if war should break again upon the country, will, as in the olden days, stand once more shoulder to shoulder, with no distinction in the colors that they wear. It is fraught with tidings of peace on earth, and you may read its meaning in the words on yonder picture, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

THE PURITANS

IN ANSWER TO A TOAST AT THE DINNER OF THE NEW
ENGLAND SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA,
DECEMBER 22, 1887

THE PURITANS

THIS is the day that New England men everywhere set apart as sacred to the memory of those who founded the brave old commonwealths where they were born, and which, however far they may have wandered, they never cease to love. In so doing they only obey a most deeply-rooted instinct of human nature. One of the earliest forms of religion to which primitive man turned for consolation and support was ancestor worship. Indeed, it is but the other day that Japan disestablished Shintoism, the official religion of the state, an ancestor worship which for ages has maintained itself in the face of newer faiths and more popular creeds. The religious form of ancestor worship has departed long since from our race, but the sentiment remains. The Chinaman, who reverses all our habits, has his ancestors ennobled when he himself arrives at distinction. The people of the Western world turn their ancestors to better account, by using them as an argument in favor of benefits to be conferred upon themselves. To us in this country, where all hereditary distinctions have been from the outset wisely abolished, ancestors are chiefly useful as furnishing pleasant opportunities of this kind for mental and moral improvement. To the New Englander they have an especial value, because his retiring and modest nature makes him unwilling to assert himself or sing his own praises. His diffidence, therefore, finds a welcome shelter in doing justice to ancestral

deeds and virtues, and thus he is able to shine with the mild refulgence of a reflected light.

Nothing in this way could be more suggestive than the name of the famous old county which you have coupled with mine. In Essex County the Puritan founded his first town and set up his first church. As the Puritans of Essex were first in order of settlement, so were they always the most extreme representatives of the day in politics or religion. It was the stern old Essex Puritan John Endicott who cut St. George's cross from the English flag because it savored of idolatry. It was an Essex clergyman who was cast out of his pulpit because he led his townsmen in a refusal to pay illegal impositions to Andros, as John Hampden had refused ship money to Charles I. It was in Essex that resistance was organized to the domination of the capital; and it was in Essex, too, that the dark and morbid side of Puritan faith found its last expression in the madness of the witchcraft trials. So when we speak of Essex County the name brings to us all that is most characteristic and most essential in Puritanism.

The time has come when we ought to judge the Puritan fairly, and see him as he really was, — not tricked out in virtues which he never would have claimed, nor bedaubed with vices of which he was entirely innocent. There is no lack of opportunity for fit judgment. The Puritan did not creep along the byways of his time. He stands out in history as distinctly as a Greek temple on a hill-top against the brightness of the clear twilight sky. It is a stern figure enough, lacking many of the ordinary graces, but it is a manly figure withal, full of strength and force and purpose. He had grave faults, but they were the faults of a strong and not a weak nature, and his

virtues were those of a robust man of lofty aims. It is true that he drove Roger Williams into exile and persecuted the Antinomians, but he founded successful and God-fearing commonwealths. He hanged Quakers, and in a mad panic put old women to death as witches, but he planted a college in the wilderness and put a schoolhouse in every village. He made a narrow creed the test of citizenship, but he founded the town-meeting, where every man helped to govern and where all men were equal before the law. He banished harmless pleasures and cast a gloom over daily life, but he formed the first union of States in the New England confederacy, and through the mouth of one of the witchcraft judges uttered an eloquent protest against human slavery a century before Garrison was born or Wilberforce began his agitation. He refused liberty of conscience to those who sought it beneath the shadow of his meeting-house, but he kept the torch of learning burning brightly in the New World. In the fullness of time he broke the fetters which he had himself forged for the human mind, as he had formerly broken the shackles of Laud and Charles. He was rigid in his prejudices, and filled with an intense pride of race and home, but when the storm of war came upon the colonies he gave without measure and without stint to the common cause.

Has not New England, the home of the Puritan, learned, too, the lesson of the times as the long procession of the years moved by? Has she not learned and taken to her heart the lesson of this great commonwealth, which from the beginning stood for a free church in a free state, the doctrine now accepted throughout the length and breadth of the land? Has she not freed herself from the narrowing influence of her early creeds, and turned her intellect to broader and nobler works?

Call the roll of our poets and you will find New England's answer in the names of Longfellow and Lowell, of Emerson and Holmes. Call the roll of our historians and you will find her answer again in the names of Prescott and Motley, of Bancroft and Parkman. Turn to old Essex, the birthplace and the centre of Puritanism, and she will respond with the greatest name of all, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and yet again with that beloved name to which we all bowed in reverence but the other day, the name of Whittier. To-day Essex holds as her noblest possession, and the Puritan States cherish above all men, the gracious poet who by pure and noble verse has been a voice and a guide to their people. Yet this poet whom New England so loves and cherishes is a member of that sect which two hundred years ago she persecuted and exiled. Is not this in itself a commentary upon the growth of New England above all tributes of praise?

We honor the Puritan, despite all his errors, for his strong, bold nature, his devotion to civic freedom, and his stern, unconquerable will. We would not barter our descent from him for the pedigree of kings. May we not now say that we also honor him because his race has shown itself able to break through its own trammels, and "rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things"?

HARVARD COLLEGE IN POLITICS

FROM A SPEECH AT THE MEETING OF THE HARVARD
REPUBLICAN CLUB, IN TREMONT TEMPLE,
NOVEMBER 22, 1888

HARVARD COLLEGE IN POLITICS

WE meet here to-night with a definite purpose, and we meet in the name of Harvard. That name is dear, not only to Harvard's children, but to every son of Massachusetts. The ground on which her temples stand is holy ground. It is sacred to learning, to patriotism, and to truth. Fair Harvard! The name is girt with traditions which tell of the dark days of the savage and the wilderness, when the lamp of learning was first lighted on these barren shores. They speak to us of the patriotism of 1776 and of 1861. They tell the long story of noble lives unselfishly given to the cause of American scholarship.

We do not gather here to assert that we are the sole and only representatives of the college. All that we lay claim to is the right, common to all her sons, to serve, honor, and defend her with loyalty and truth. We do not come to give out to the world that Harvard College supports the party to which we belong. Were such the purpose of this meeting, I for one would have no part or lot in it. We gather here to protest, in the only way open to us, against the attempt which has been made to drag the college into politics, and to use her honored name as a makeweight in party strife. We are not here to declare that the college is Republican, but to stamp as utterly false the assertion that our beloved alma mater is bound to the wheels of any man's political chariot. Harvard

belongs to no party and to no sect. Her doors stand open to men of every faith and every creed, and from her precincts they go out into the world with her blessing upon them to fight the battle of life each in his own way. No man and no set of men have the right to speak for the great university. She is not the property of any one. She speaks for herself. She is dedicated to Christ and the Church, and the single word upon her broad shield is Truth. She asks no blind subservience to the doctrines of any man. She gives to all who come to her a liberal education, not in the mere technical sense, but in the broad spirit of tolerance and free inquiry. She teaches respect for the pursuits and opinions of others. She frowns upon that narrowness which imputes unworthy motives to those who differ from it. She says to all: Think for yourselves, love your country, and follow truth as you see it, with an open mind and an honest heart.

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

IN ANSWER TO A TOAST AT THE DINNER OF THE NEW
ENGLAND SOCIETY OF BROOKLYN,
DECEMBER 21, 1888

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

THERE is one toast, Mr. President, to which no son of New England can ever refuse to respond, one sentiment to which he must always answer. When the President of a New England society looks toward any one and says, "I give you Forefathers' Day," even the most modest among us must rise and speak. Those two simple words have a world of meaning to the children of the Pilgrim and the Puritan. Mathematics symbolizes the unknown by a single letter, and expresses infinity by another. So when we meet upon this anniversary our imagination gathers into those two words all that we mean by New England. For us they stop the hurrying tide of daily life, and open the leaves of memory's book. In them we hear again the solemn music of the wind among New England's pines. When those magic words are uttered, the murmur of the rivers and the roar of the mountain torrents, the crash of the surf upon the ledges and the gentle lapping of the summer sea upon the shingle, sound once more in our ears. Again we see the meadows green and shining with the touch of spring, and the rocky hillsides brilliant with the goldenrod or glowing in the purple flush of autumn. All the scenes that we knew in childhood, and that in manhood we do not forget, rise up before us. It is but a little corner of the great land which we call our own, and yet we love it.

We repeat the words and turn again the pages of memory; the landscape fades and the figures of the past are before us. We pass out of the eager, bustling present and are once more in touch with the strong race which clung to the rocky coast until they made it their own, and whose children and whose children's children have forced their way across the continent, carrying with them the principles and the beliefs of the forefathers.

The Pilgrim and the Puritan whom we honor to-night were men who did a great work in the world. They had their faults and shortcomings, but they were not slothful in business and they were most fervent in spirit. They founded prosperous commonwealths, and built up governments of laws and not of men. They carried the light of learning undimmed through the early years of settlement. They planted a schoolhouse in every village, and fought always a good fight for ordered liberty and for human rights. Their memories shall not perish, for

“the actions of the just
Smell sweet and blossom in the dust.”

I have read, sir, that the Pilgrims and the Puritans among their other virtues did not number that of tolerance. Hostile critics have indeed insinuated that there was something not unlike persecution for opinion's sake in early New England. But, however it may have been at that time, in these latter days it has been the characteristic of New England to cherish freedom of speech, and nowhere is a greater latitude found than at these very New England dinners. No one, so far as my observation goes, ever seems to feel restricted by the sentiment to which he is asked to answer, even when it is as novel as the one you have kindly assigned to me, and I am going to avail myself of this liberality.

There is a wide field opened here before each one of us among subjects of present interest. Among other events there has been an election. I should like of course to point out its lessons. Pointing out the lessons of an election, however, although pleasant, is one-sided, for I have noticed that it is an exercise in which the winners are prone to indulge without much aid from the vanquished. I should like to preach to you on this text, for we New Englanders have too much of the old Puritan blood not to like to preach, especially to somebody else, but I will put the temptation aside and spare your patience.

There is, however, one phase of the election which I think reaches far beyond party, if we take the trouble to go a little beneath the surface. I refer to the strong American feeling, that was developed during the canvass, not in noise and shouts, but in regard to many vital questions. This feeling I think is going to last. The War for the Union and the issues springing from it have been settled. While they lasted they overshadowed everything else. But all the time other questions have been growing up with the growth of the nation, and are now coming to the front for decision. It is our duty to settle them, not only in the right way, but in a thoroughly American fashion. By Americanism I do not mean that which had a brief political existence more than thirty years ago. That movement was based on race and sect, and was therefore thoroughly un-American, and failed, as all un-American movements have failed in this country. True Americanism is opposed utterly to any political divisions resting on race and religion. To the race or to the sect which as such attempts to take possession of the politics or the public education of the country, true Americanism says, Hands off! The American idea is a free church in a

free state, and a free and unsectarian public school in every ward and in every village, with its doors wide open to the children of all races and of every creed. It goes still further, and frowns upon the constant attempt to divide our people according to origin or extraction. Let every man honor and love the land of his birth and the race from which he springs and keep their memory green. It is a pious and honorable duty. But let us have done with British-Americans and Irish-Americans and German-Americans, and so on, and all be Americans, — nothing more and nothing less. If a man is going to be an American at all let him be so without any qualifying adjectives; and if he is going to be something else, let him drop the word American from his personal description.

As there are sentiments and beliefs like these to be cherished, so there are policies which must be purely and wholly American and to “the manner born” if we would have them right and successful. True Americanism recognizes the enormous gravity of the social and labor problems which confront us. It believes that the safety of the republic depends upon well-paid labor and the highest possible average of individual well-being. It believes that the right solution of this problem should be sought without rest and without stay, and that no device, public or private, of legislation or of individual effort, which can tend to benefit and elevate the condition of the great wage-earning masses of this country, should be left untried. It sets its face rigidly against the doctrine of the Anarchist and the Communist, who seek to solve the social problems, not by patient endeavor, but by brutal destruction. “That way madness lies,” — and such attempts and such teachings, barbarous and un-American as they

are, must and will be put down with a strong and unflinching hand, in the name of the home and the church and the school, and of all that makes up civilization and the possibility of human progress.

In the great public lands of the West an American policy sees one of the safeguards of the republic. It opposes the further use of these lands to invite immigration or to attract speculation. They should be the heritage of the American people, and not a bait to draw a surplus population that we do not want. The true American policy goes further, and believes that immigration should not only not be stimulated, but that it should be restricted. The pauper and the criminal, the diseased and the vicious, the Anarchist, the Communist and the polygamist, should be absolutely shut out, while the general flow of immigration should be wisely and judiciously checked.

It is the American policy to admit to the Union the great territories of the West as fast as they can fulfill the conditions of statehood; but it is not the American policy to admit an un-American territory with a population of Mexicans who speak Spanish, or Utah with a population which defies our laws and maintains a barbarous and corrupting system of marriage. When these two territories are thoroughly Americanized, they can come in with the rest and take part in our government, but not before.

It is the American policy never to meddle in the affairs of other nations, but to see to it that our attitude toward the rest of the world is dignified, and that our flag is respected in every corner of the earth, and backed by a navy which shall be an honor to the American name.

Last and greatest of all, true Americanism demands that the ballot box everywhere shall be inviolate, even if it

takes the whole force of the United States to make it so. The people's confidence in the decision of the ballot box is the only guaranty we have of the safety of our institutions, and we do not now guard it as we ought. It is to these things that the American people are looking; and while they have no ignorant contempt for the experience of other nations, they are firm in the faith that they must settle their own problems in their own way, in accordance with their own conditions and in the light of their own ideas and beliefs. In that faith they will meet the problems and the difficulties which they, in common with all mankind, must face. They will move on with a high and confident spirit; they will extinguish the last traces of sectional differences, and if they are true to themselves they will yet do the best work that has ever been given to any people on earth to do.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT

SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MAY 2, 1890

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT

MR. SPEAKER, all property is the creation of law.

“The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can,”

has been replaced in the progress of civilization by law. The title deed of the sword has given way to the title deed of the pen. From one kind of possession to another the law has marched on, extending at the same time its protection, first given to the native of the land, to the stranger within its gates.

The most recent advance is that which has recognized property in the creations of the mind, in inventions or in books, the latter of which is known as literary property. This formal recognition dates back, with the English-speaking race, to the statute of Anne; and for two hundred and fifty years all who used “that ample speech, that subtle speech,” have maintained the wisdom of the legislation. Literary property is recognized also in the Constitution of the United States, and the justice of copyright has never been questioned in this country.

The next step, as in the case of other property, is to accord to the stranger and the outsider the same property rights that our laws accord to the native of the country. In all cases of ordinary property this has been fully and amply done; but the last step in this path, that which

most conspicuously separates the civilized from the half-civilized or barbarous nation, has not yet been taken by the United States.

We do not yet recognize the property right of the foreigner in the product of his mind, or, in other words, in his book. To my thinking, this is simple dishonesty, but I do not propose, sir, to argue that point. In the first place it is too plain a proposition to invite discussion, and in the second place national honor does not seem to be the subject of the story with those who speak in opposition to this bill. The opponents of the bill rest their case on widely different grounds, and seem only anxious to show that what is stolen is cheap. There certainly is some foundation for this view if we are short-sighted as to both the moral and the economic effects. I have no doubt that when Rob Roy lifted cattle, cattle were cheaper among the MacGregors than they were immediately after the death of that lamented chieftain. But I do not think that that fact alters the ethics of the question.

“ In vain we call old notions fudge
And bend our conscience to our dealing ;
The Ten Commandments will not budge,
And stealing will continue stealing.”

The great argument that is made here in opposition to international copyright is that this bill, if it passes, is going to make literature dear to the American people. Mr. Speaker, it will do nothing of the kind, and the assertion that it will do so is the barest assumption ever made. Take France, for example, which has an international copyright and has had for years. They issue there several popular series, well printed, perfectly readable, at five cents and even two cents a number ; and these series contain the best literature of France and of the world, not

the offscourings of the literary gutters of other countries. The same is true in Germany; and the effect of the law here will be, not to make literature dear, but in the series of cheap books simply to substitute for the works of foreigners the works of American authors. In France and Germany the best literature is the cheapest. With us the exact reverse is the case, and we tempt our people to read what is worst and even assist them to do so by making it cheap. In one word, cheapness is determined by the conditions of your market and by the demands of your reading public, and not by copyright laws.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Payson) produced the catalogue of the Seaside Library, and declared that nine tenths of it was standard literature. He read the names of some standard authors, of Carlyle and others, as if they and those like them filled the list. Now, see how plain a tale will put him down. Of the 1,073 books in the Seaside Library, 92 per cent. are novels, and 97 per cent. are written by foreigners. The same proportion holds true in other cases, as any one can see who will read the careful analysis of Mr. Brander Matthews in his admirable essay on "Cheap Books and Good Books." Instead of nine tenths being standard literature in such series as these, nine tenths are fiction, of which the greater part is at the best foolish and enervating, and at the worst positively vicious.

In this connection, allusion was made to Dickens. No book, let me say in passing, which was written before the passage of this act, is affected by it. But the gentleman says that, if that is true, we must look to the Dickens that is to come. Suppose another Dickens does come, or any man of equal genius writing in the English tongue, would the American people grudge to him who ministered

so to their pleasure, with whom they have wept and laughed, who has lightened their sorrow and softened their labors, the small royalty that an author receives on his work? Would they grudge to-day to the creator of all that marvelous fiction, from the "Pickwick Papers" to "Edwin Drood," a share in the profits which are now reaped exclusively by the publisher? Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it for one moment. Such meanness would be impossible to the American people, the most generous people in the world.

But, sir, in the brief time allowed me I wish to speak chiefly in behalf of the writers of America, in behalf of those who write and make books, of the men who live by the pen, the journalists and essayists, the writers of fiction and the writers of history, and of the printers who aid them in the mechanical part of their task. They do not come here and ask you for subventions, or subsidies, bounties, or protection. They do not ask you to take their property as security, and issue to them a large amount of money upon it, or to build them warehouses in every county. They ask you simply for justice; that you shall not discriminate against them, and make still smaller and harder opportunities and earnings which are never either large or easy. That is all they ask; nothing else.

You now take the foreign author's works and pay him nothing. You save on these the copyright, which on an average is ten per cent. royalty, and by this discrimination you drive the American author out of his own market. Speaking as one who has followed in a humble way the career of literature, I say to this House that I do not understand how any one in his senses can imagine that the American author would not desire the great circula-

tion and corresponding profit of cheap editions. That is really all we ask for, and yet no American publisher can undertake to print an American book, with rare exceptions, in one of these cheap editions, for the simple reason that he must pay the American author a royalty, while he pays the foreign author none. This is a direct and unjust discrimination against the American author.

As for the combinations that are talked of, the monopolies that are used here as bugbears, where are they?

There is one lying dormant now in the cheap reprints, and if this bill is defeated that trust in cheap reprints will spring into life. International copyright is free copyright, which is equal protection to all, and that is the way to stop that trust. The present partial system is the way to make trusts and combinations possible, and nothing else.

There is one other point, more important than any other, which I wish to make to the House, and that is that we give to our reading public, to our girls and boys, our young men and women, at the most impressionable age, when their ideas and habits of thought are forming, the very books that we ought not to give them. We should furnish them with a high order of books, not foreign books, not cheap books, not translations by the myriad of French novels dedicated, as Matthew Arnold said, to the goddess of "Lubricity," not second-class English novels, the novels of the snob and the tuft-hunter, written about dukes and duchesses and lords and ladies from the point of view of a lackey, and which hold up ideals utterly hostile to ours. Not such stuff as this should we encourage and even force our youth to read, but the best books of all ages, and especially wholesome American books, which will bring them up to love America, which

will fill them with American ideas, with reverence and love for American principles of government, and with respect for American society, instead of admiration for systems of government and society wholly alien to their own. Nothing is cheap that is false. Let us be true to ourselves and to the youth of the Republic.

In their name I ask for a favorable vote on this bill. I ask for it in the name of the printers, forty thousand of whom stand behind this bill, because they see that it will increase the work and the wages of the American workmen. I hold in my hand a telegram from a man who once stood at the case, and who now holds an honorable place among you here, in which he says: "Ask for leave to print on the copyright bill. I hope it will pass. AMOS J. CUMMINGS."

I ask for it in the name of every man who uses a pen, whether on the daily press or in making a book, of the men who minister to your information, to your amusement and to your instruction. Think what we owe to literature; a debt which never can be paid. "Books," says Dr. Johnson, "help us to enjoy life or teach us to endure it." What a service is this. Be just, at least to those who help us to enjoy and teach us to endure. I ask it most of all in the name of the national honor. As an American I deplore the spectacle of the United States alone among the civilized nations taking the highwayman's attitude, robbing the foreign and the native author alike, and injuring their own readers beyond the power of words to describe. In the name of all these, of printers, writers, and readers, and of the good name of the Republic itself, I hope that the bill will pass.

THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PUBLIC
SCHOOL. A REPLY

SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JANUARY 13, 1890

THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL. A REPLY

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12573) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes, —

MR. LODGE said :

MR. CHAIRMAN: I find by the Record of this morning that while I was absent from the House yesterday afternoon on business connected with the Naval Committee, of which I am a member, I was honored by a personal attack from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Stone]. The carefully prepared sentences of that effort show much labor, and it was evidently the intention of the gentleman to be severe. He has, however, mistaken abuse for severity; and into a competition of coarse personal abuse I have no intention of entering. In that field I willingly yield to him the supremacy.

I have never indulged in personalities in debate. I have always found it possible to discuss public measures without personal allusions to the gentlemen who have differed from myself in opinion. From that habit I do not intend to deviate now or at any time. I am always ready to concede to gentlemen who differ from me the same sincerity of motive and honesty of purpose that I claim for myself. But at the same time I have a large char-

ity, Mr. Chairman, for those gentlemen whose mental limitations are such that they can reach notoriety only by indulging in personalities. The head and front of my offending, it appears, is that I am in part responsible for the Federal election bill. That bill was reported from my committee. With my colleague from Illinois [Mr. Rowell] and other gentlemen I helped to frame it. With their aid I helped to pass it through the House.

Whatever the defects or imperfections of that measure may be, I believe most thoroughly in the principle which it involves. It is the principle of honest elections and of the protection of the ballot box, not in the South, not in the North, but throughout the length and breadth of the land. With that principle I am always ready and always proud to be identified. I believe that the Republican party can make no greater mistake after its past and its pledges than to fail now either here or elsewhere in loyalty to the doctrine of protection to the ballot box. I am quite ready to let my record stand on that question, and it does not disturb me in the least that gentlemen of the other side should assail me on account of it. It only shows that the shaft was well aimed and that it has gone home.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seems to be annoyed that I had a great-grandfather. George Cabot was a respectable, honorable, and not altogether undistinguished man, and I am very proud of his memory, although he held some views in politics with which I do not personally agree. No attack upon New England, however, would ever be complete without an allusion to the Hartford Convention, of which he was president. It has been the unfailing resource of Democratic statesmen, when at a loss to say something disagreeable about New England, for the

last seventy-five years, and I suppose it will continue to serve their turn for many more years to come, especially as the members of that convention are unable to resent anything that may be said of them.

The attitude of New England Federalists from 1807 to 1815 is one with which I have little sympathy and have had less and less as I have gone on in life ; but gentlemen on the other side seem to forget that the position taken by the Hartford Convention was but a repetition of the position taken by Jefferson and Madison in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. It was, whether you call it "nullification" or "interposition," the doctrine that State rights are capable of overruling the power and the laws of the National Government. To that principle I am opposed, whether it emanated in times past from Virginia or Kentucky or New England. But it ill becomes representatives of the South, even when they are most at a loss for an argument, to rail at New England about a doctrine which first found root in their soil and which there and there alone flourished and grew until it blossomed into the red flower of rebellion.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri also saw fit in the course of his remarks to assail a Senator from my State, who could by no possibility reply to him on this floor. For a speech less violent in language, relating to another Senator, this House saw fit to take very decisive action of censure. I leave it to the House to say whether the time has not come now to repeat that action.

The Senator from my State to whom the allusion was made would not wish me, nor would he deem it necessary, that I should enter into any defense of him from such an attack as that made here yesterday. Long after the gentleman who made it has passed from this House into that

forgetfulness which awaits him and perhaps most of us, the name of the Senator to whom he referred will remain in the history of the United States as that of a ripe scholar and a patriotic, far-seeing statesman, identified with great policies and useful measures, who would have been an honor to any State or any country. Still less, Mr. Chairman, should I deem it necessary on this occasion to defend either New England or Massachusetts. The history of Massachusetts is before the world and is known of all men. As Webster said: "She needs no eulogium; there she stands; behold her and judge for yourselves."

There, too, is her great record of service to the cause of human rights and human liberty. There are the names of her statesmen and of her soldiers shining ever with a lustre no slanders can dim. There are her lasting services to the advancement of the highest civilization. They are all written in the pages of the history of the United States. They stand there forever for the considerate judgment of mankind; and her people have no fear of the verdict.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman saw fit in what was intended, I suppose, to be one of his most wounding passages, to refer to me as the "Oscar Wilde of American statesmanship." It was a perfectly safe attack, for it is quite impossible for me to retort in kind, as I am not aware that the gentleman is the proprietor of any kind of statesmanship whatever. I suppose the allusion was really meant to convey the idea that the statesmanship of Massachusetts and of New England is "effeminate." That is a very easy accusation to make. It is a view which naturally is taken of a high civilization by a lower one. It is the view which would naturally be taken of the civilization of the public school by the civilization of the shotgun.

But let me say, Mr. Chairman, that when the two civilizations came in armed contact there was nothing "effeminate" then in the civilization of the public school and of personal liberty. The civilization of the shotgun and of the slave went down before it in bloody ruin, never to be restored.

MASSACHUSETTS

FROM CLOSING SPEECH IN DEBATE WITH HON. JOHN E.
RUSSELL, TREMONT TEMPLE, OCTOBER 23, 1891

MASSACHUSETTS

IT is a high honor to be Governor of Massachusetts. To all who dwell within her confines, the old State is very, very dear. She has a right to our love and pride. "Behold her and judge for yourselves." Here she is, a Queen among commonwealths, enthroned amidst her hills and streams, with the ocean at her feet. Trade is in her marts and prayer within her temples. Her cities stir with busy life. Her wealth grows, beyond the dreams of avarice. Her rivers turn the wheels of industry, and the smoke of countless chimneys tells the story of the inventor's genius and the workman's skill. But the material side is the least of it. We rejoice mightily in her prosperity, but our love and pride are touched by nobler themes. We love the old State. The sand hills of the Cape, with the gulls wheeling over the waste of waters; the gray ledges and green pastures of Essex, with the seas surging forever on her rocks; the broad and fruitful valleys of the Connecticut; the dark hills and murmuring streams of Berkshire, have to us a tender charm no other land can give. They breathe to us the soft message that tells of home and country. Still it is something more than the look of hill and dale, something deeper than habit which stirs our hearts when we think of Massachusetts. Behind the outward form of things lies that which passeth show. It is in the history of Massachusetts, in the lives of her great men,

in the sacrifices, in the deeds and in the character of her people that we find the true secret of our love and pride. We may not explain it even to ourselves, but it is there in the good old name, and flushes into life at the sight of the white flag. Massachusetts! Utter but the word and what memories throng upon her children! Here came the stern, God-fearing men to find a home and found a State. Here, almost where we stand, on the edge of the wilderness, was placed the first public school. Yonder, across the river, where the track of the savage still lingered and the howl of the wolf was still heard, was planted the first college. Here, through years of peril and privation, with much error and failure, but ever striving and marching onward, the Puritans built their State. It was this old town that first resisted England and bared its breast to receive the hostile spears. In the fields of Middlesex the first blood was shed in the American Revolution. On the slopes of Bunker Hill the British troops first recoiled under American fire. Massachusetts was the first great Commonwealth to resist the advance of slavery, and in the mighty war for the Union she had again the sad honor to lay the first blood offering on the altar of the nation. This is the State that Winthrop founded. Warren died for her liberties and Webster defended her good name. Sumner bore stripes in behalf of her beliefs, and her sons gave their lives on every battlefield for the one flag she held more sacred than her own. She has fought for liberty. She has done justice between man and man. She has sought to protect the weak, to save the erring, to raise the unfortunate. She has been the fruitful mother of ideas as of men. Her thought has followed the sun and been felt throughout the length of the land. May we not say, as Charles Fox

said of Switzerland, "Every man should desire once in his life to make a pilgrimage to Massachusetts, the land of liberty and peace?" She has kept her shield unspotted and her honor pure. To us, her loving children, she is a great heritage and a great trust.

It is a noble thing to be Governor of such a State. And let it never be forgotten that it is no light matter to hold the place once held by John A. Andrew, when he "stood as high priest between the horns of the altar and poured out upon it the best blood of Massachusetts."

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER.

SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MARCH 23, 1892.

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER.

A bill (H. R. 4426) for the free coinage of gold and silver, and for the issue of coin notes, and for other purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The statistics relating to silver and the silver question, to gold and to the ratio between them, are many. They have been brought together from various quarters, chiefly from Sauerbeck, and have seen a great deal of hard service of late years in both branches of Congress. They have been drawn out in regiments and platoons; they have been marched and countermarched; they have been paraded and formed in very hollow squares to resist cavalry; in fact they have done their duty, and I at least do not propose to torment further these over-worked figures. I desire merely to discuss this bill very briefly in its practical bearings upon the currency and business of the country.

There are two points of view from which the silver question may be approached; one is the international and the other the domestic side. Internationally the question is whether the demonetization of silver, which has been adopted by England and Germany and which is threatened by Austria, has been a wise and beneficial policy for the business interests of the civilized world. England first put in practice the theory of a single gold standard. Thereupon, as is always the case when any economic theory is adopted by England, English statesmen and

economists at once proceeded to argue that no other system was sane, possible, or even honest, and thus they have continued, although the chorus is no longer quite as harmonious as at the start. . . . They have in this case as in others cried out with one voice that no intelligent man, no man of education, no moral man, could possibly hold any doctrine but that of the single gold standard.

It will be generally found, I think, that when England adopts an economic theory it is because her people believe that it is profitable to do so. When, however, they have once taken up a policy out of which they believe they can make money, they like to have it understood that it is really virtue and not money which they seek, and so they indulge in loud declarations of the immutable truth of their theory and of the wickedness and dishonesty of every one who does not agree with them. This little peculiarity would concern them alone were it not that there is a certain number of persons in this country who are always awed by the confident English assertions, and repeat them with parrot-like exactness. The question of the use of silver in the world's currency, however, is too large and difficult a subject to be settled by merely swallowing, whole, opinions made up and administered by some one else. It is a subject on which we ought to think for ourselves, and reach our own conclusions.

As the matter stands to-day Germany has followed the example of England in demonetizing silver, and the effect of their joint action has been so serious in the transaction of the world's business that there is at this moment in England itself a strong party which favors the restoration of silver. The international question, therefore, is whether we shall exclude silver from the world's currency or whether we shall return to the old policy of the use of

both metals. This question seems to turn on a single point, and that is whether there is enough gold to serve even the very limited purposes for which under the modern system of exchanges gold is required, or, in other words, whether there is gold enough to pay trade balances and supply the necessary reserve for the issue of paper money. This is a large question, upon which it is extremely difficult to speak with any certainty, and I am not sure that we have enough facts in our possession to determine the point absolutely.

Such evidence, however, as we have all appears to point one way. The events of the last two years certainly seem to indicate that the world's supply of gold is insufficient to meet the purposes for which gold is required. The rapidly recurring business panics at different money centres, together with the struggles of the various nations to secure gold, all point to a very insufficient supply and to the necessity of using both metals instead of one only in the world's currency. I believe that if we in this country were to cease to hold up silver and were to stop its use in our currency, we should in less than two years compel its restoration by all civilized nations unless the supply of gold were greatly enlarged.

But, however all this may be, it does not touch the practical domestic question now before this House. In settling that we can deal only with existing facts, and our views as to the international policy are not relevant. What, then, are the actual conditions? Silver has been demonetized by two of the great commercial nations of the world, and the world's standard of value at this moment is a gold standard. The question for us is not whether we will join in an international agreement to restore silver to the world's circulation, but whether,

when the world's standard as a matter of fact is gold, we shall enter upon the free coinage of the silver dollar, which, by the world's standard, is worth only seventy-two cents.

For practical purposes it is of no consequence, as I have said, what our views may be as to the use of both metals or the abandonment of one in the world's currency. All that we have to decide is whether under existing conditions it is well for us to enter upon the free coinage of a silver dollar which is worth only seventy-two cents by the standard under which we, like everybody else, are carrying on and must carry on business. Under existing conditions, without any international agreement, I am utterly opposed to the free coinage of silver as proposed by this bill, and my opposition rests on the following grounds:—

I believe, in the first place, that the free coinage of the present silver dollar under present conditions means the complete disappearance of gold from our currency. Gresham's Law is one of the few economic laws which experience has shown to work with perfect certainty. The overvalued metal always drives out the undervalued metal, and irredeemable paper will of course drive out both. I need not detain the House by giving the reasons for the operation of this law, because they are familiar to every one.

In our own history we can see that the law has worked with perfect regularity. Hamilton's famous report established a correct ratio between gold and silver of 15 to 1. Then silver relatively to gold began to cheapen. Early in the present century gold was worth three per cent more as to silver than the value stamped on the coin. Gresham's Law began to work, and gold began to disappear. In 1814 the gold coinage of the United States Mint

was \$77,000; in 1815 it was \$3000; in 1816 nothing. By 1819 gold had disappeared. The difference between the metals was slight, and the law worked slowly, but none the less surely. Many suggestions and much discussion ensued in Congress, and at last, in 1834, an act was passed changing the ratio. Senator Benton, speaking in the Senate at that time, said:—

The false valuation put upon gold has rendered the mint of the United States, so far as the gold coinage is concerned, a most ridiculous and absurd institution. It has coined, and that at a large expense to the United States, 2,262,177 pieces of gold, worth \$11,852,890, and where are the pieces now? Not one of them to be seen! all sold and exported! and so regular is the operation that the Director of the Mint, in his latest report to Congress, says that the new coined gold frequently remains in the mint, uncalled for, though ready for delivery, until the day arrives for a packet to sail to Europe. He calculates that two millions of native gold will be coined annually hereafter, the whole of which, without a reform of the gold standard, will be conducted, like exiles, from the national mint to the seashore, and transported to foreign regions.

The act of 1834 fixed the ratio between the metals at 16 to 1. This reversed existing conditions, and overvalued gold. The law worked, and by 1840 the silver dollar had disappeared. From 1841 to 1851 the average world's production of gold was thirty-eight millions, and of silver thirty-four millions, a nearly equal amount. Then came the great discoveries of gold in Australia and California, and the product of gold rushed ahead of silver, thus increasing the overvaluation of gold so much that even our subsidiary coin began to disappear, and an act was passed in 1853 to prevent this inconvenience. Until the war we had gold alone, and the silver dollar was unknown. Then came the legal-tender

acts, an irredeemable paper currency, and gold followed silver, the law working this time with frightful rapidity.

I give these figures merely as illustrations of the certain working of Gresham's Law, and also to prove that there is nothing peculiar about our situation to exempt us from the operation of natural laws. When it is said in answer to this that silver coinage of late years has not driven out our gold, the explanation is simple. We have not had free coinage, and the country by its natural growth has been able to absorb in its ordinary business the monthly increase of silver. Moreover, we have thus far with a limited coinage managed to maintain the silver dollar at par, because we have been able, and everybody has known that we were able, to give a gold for a silver dollar as much as for a greenback or for a gold certificate.

But if this bill should become a law, gold would immediately disappear, because there would then be free competition between the overvalued and the undervalued metal. It would not all go out of the country, of course, but it would disappear in a very few days, for the simple reason that people would hoard gold, either because they expected to export it at a profit, or because they were frightened and wished to keep it. The first effect, therefore, of free coinage would be an immediate and most severe contraction of the currency, for it would be some time before silver could come in and take the place of the vast quantity of gold thus suddenly withdrawn. When that time arrived, the period of inflation would set in, because there is an immense amount of silver in the world which it would be profitable to pour in here for coinage.

The result, economically speaking, would be to put us on a silver basis, to make us monometallists, with silver as the metal. This position seems to me indefensible, whether

one is in theory a bimetallist or a monometallist. If you are a bimetallist, you must be opposed to a single standard, no matter what the metal is. If you are a monometallist, you must be for gold, because if there is to be but one metal used as a standard no one will dispute that for that purpose gold is superior to silver.

In the second place, I am opposed to free coinage because I believe it would be a great injustice to the masses of the people, and would entail on them almost incalculable loss and suffering. There is no greater fallacy than that which is involved in the argument that the free coinage of a depreciated dollar would benefit the people because it would help the debtor class to pay their debts at a heavy discount. I know that this idea, although not openly avowed, lies at the bottom of much of the popular support of free silver, but it is none the less a delusion. Broadly speaking, the wage-earning class, which constitutes the great mass of the people of the United States, is the creditor class, and the capitalists and business men are the borrowing class. The validity of this classification is not affected in the least by the undoubted fact that there are many wage-earners and farmers who have borrowed money, usually on mortgage.

This is a fact which may mislead superficial observers; but the general truth in regard to the body of the people is that the wage-earners are creditors, and capitalists, corporations, and business men are borrowers. The men and women who earn daily wages are creditors at the end of every month, of every week, and of every day. Their small savings also, accumulated in large masses in banks, are borrowed by capitalists for business enterprises, and thus the best and most thrifty among them become creditors again. The great mass of the debts of this country

are owed by railroads, by corporations of every kind, by capitalists, and by all men engaged in the promotion of great business enterprises.

Establish free coinage of silver in this country to-day, and as we shall still continue to do business on the world's standard, you will begin to pay creditors seventy-two cents on the dollar. In this situation the capitalist can protect himself, but the wage-earner cannot. The men and women who are earning daily wages will be the first to receive seventy-two cents on the dollar in payment for what they earn, and they will be the last to obtain even a partial advance when the period of inflation sets in. The capitalist is always protected in some degree at least, but the wage-earner is utterly unprotected, and upon him the unlimited issue of a depreciated dollar will fall with peculiar force. There is no money so dear to the great wage-earning classes as what is called cheap money. In writing of the state of the English currency after the many years of Stuart misgovernment, Lord Macaulay says: —

It may well be doubted whether all the misery which had been inflicted on the English nation in a quarter of a century by bad kings, bad ministers, bad Parliaments, and bad judges was equal to the misery caused in a single year by bad crowns and bad shillings. When the great instrument of exchange became thoroughly deranged, all trade, all industry, were smitten as with a palsy.

The statement is not overcharged, and the principle on which it rests is as true and living now as in the days of William of Orange.

I am opposed to free coinage of silver because it means contraction first, inflation second, and a continual derangement of values. When the currency is disturbed and

values are unsettled, gambling speculation flourishes and legitimate business declines.

The decline of legitimate business, the lack of confidence among business men, mean not only loss to them, but ruin to countless people who depend on innumerable business enterprises for their daily bread. Stability of the currency is a prime condition of business prosperity, and business cannot prosper unless confidence founded on a reasonable anticipation of the future prevails. With a disordered currency such confidence is impossible, and business paralysis is certain to ensue.

The country does not believe that free coinage can become a law at the present time, but the effect of free coinage in destroying business confidence is already perceptible in the attitude of foreign investors. We have had a year of unusual prosperity, and Europe has been obliged to buy our crops at our own prices. The trade balance has been something like one hundred and seventy millions in our favor, and yet at this moment we are exporting gold. In other words, Europe is paying the enormous trade balances in American securities.

I am very far from attributing this merely to alarm about the silver question, for a year ago last fall England passed through a terrible business crisis. To get money she sold American securities because they were the best and most salable thing she had, and that movement has not spent its force. But, although some people in England lost a great deal of money, many did not, and it is the people who did not lose and who have money to invest who are affected by the silver bill. They would take American securities, which experience has shown them to be the best, if they were not alarmed by the prospect of free coinage and its consequent derangement of values.

We need abundant capital in the United States, and no part of the country needs it so much as those regions where the movement for free coinage is strongest. Every American security that we buy back means just so much American capital shut out from new enterprises and from the work of developing the still undeveloped resources of many of our states.

I oppose the free coinage of the silver dollar, therefore, because I believe that it means putting us on the single silver standard and separating us from the standard of the civilized world; because it will bring heavy loss to the great wage-earning classes of the country; because it means a disordered currency and unsettled values, which bring in their train the destruction of public confidence and the arrest of business activity. I paired against the consideration of this measure because a vote against any consideration is to my mind equivalent to a vote to kill the bill. I paired against postponement, and shall vote against all postponement, because postponement was and is merely an attempt to evade for the convenience of a small minority of the Democratic party a question which ought to be settled now, and because this evasion is, in my opinion, much worse for the country than a decisive vote.

It is the fashion in certain quarters to talk about the free-silver movement as merely the corrupt effort of a few mine-owners to enrich themselves. Nothing is gained by such deception as this. Undoubtedly the mine-owners with a selfish interest in free coinage have done and are doing all in their power to foster and strengthen the movement, but it is equally undoubted that if the mine-owners were the only people interested in free coinage the question would never be heard of in this House. The rich mine-owner is no more popular in this body than any other successful capitalist.

The strength of the silver movement lies in the fact that large bodies of the people of this country honestly believe that free coinage will be beneficial to them. To me this seems a pitiful delusion, but there is no use in blinking the fact, and I have no sympathy with the practice of calling all those who differ with me on this subject either knaves or madmen.

The Democratic party, partly from conviction and partly for votes, has adopted this free-silver movement and become its political champion. The casuistry and deception so freely used in my part of the country to prove that the Democratic party, which by an overwhelming majority favored free coinage, was really against it, will serve no longer. The veil has been rent away, and the true purposes of the Democratic party are laid bare. It is the natural ally of the free-silver movement. When that small minority of the Democrats who believe in sound money are in such a state of mental confusion that they insist that seventy members of this House are more numerous than one hundred and forty, what is to be expected of the party generally on a question of finance? The Democratic party has taken its position, and I rejoice that it has done so, for it means that we shall have a square, honest fight and no more hidings and evasions.

As I have said, great bodies of our people believe in free coinage. I feel sure that they are utterly wrong and woefully misled in their belief; but there is only one way to meet them or to meet the movement which represents their wishes, and that is by open, strenuous, and fair public discussion. This question cannot be smothered or evaded. It can be settled only by the great tribunal of the people voting directly upon it. To them it must be appealed, and I am glad that it is coming to a vote in this House, and is

to be remitted to the people at the next election. When it is so placed before the people I have no doubt of the ultimate result. The American people will decide, as they always have decided, in favor of a stable currency and honest money.

THE TARIFF.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, APRIL 10, 1894.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes —

MR. LODGE said : —

MR. PRESIDENT: Two questions are involved in this bill. One is the effect upon our business prosperity, the wages of our workingmen, and the welfare of our people of a given set of tariff schedules and duties on imports. The other is a much wider and deeper question, and involves nothing less than a conflict between two hostile theories of government, upon the outcome of which is staked the social and political fabric which embodies our modern civilization. The first question is domestic and of the gravest and most immediate importance. But it neither belittles nor underrates it to say that it falls far short of the second in its scope and in its influence upon the fortunes of civilized man.

In what I shall say I propose to discuss the second and larger question first, for on that I think the cause in which I believe most surely rests. Protection and free trade are merely expressions in one direction of the differing theories of society and government which have been struggling for recognition and acceptance during this century, with the control of the affairs of the civilized world as the great prize set between them. They serve, however, to

illustrate and exhibit the conflict of the contending forces of which they are only the outward sign and manifestation. In examining the history of these two opposed tariff policies, we are able as readily as in any other way to reach the great principles which underlie them, and of which, as I have said, they are merely one expression.

At the outset in treating of protection and free trade, it is well to clear our minds of cant. A tariff policy in its largest sense, as a part of a general theory and system of government, and in its farthest results, may affect a nation socially, morally, and politically; it may so modify the distribution of wealth as to give it a wider and better scope, and by defending wages and standards of living may influence the whole arrangement and growth of society. On the other hand, a tariff policy in the usual and narrow sense, and especially from the standpoint of the free trader, is purely an economic matter, a question of the pocket, of dollars and cents, and of the national method of doing business. In this latter aspect certainly there is nothing either sacred or moral about a tariff system.

I have had the pleasure in recent years of hearing a number of persons discourse about free trade as a great moral issue. This attitude of mind has all the imperishable charm of springtime, and these same people have been very fond of likening themselves to the early Abolitionists and Free Soilers, as the forerunners, and, if need be, the noble but not suffering martyrs, of a great moral movement for the redemption of mankind. No one likes to lay an irreverent hand upon such beatitude as this, but it seems unavoidable to do so. There is nothing moral about the tariff question, in the narrow sense just described, nor is the morality of free trade greater than that of protection. It seems hardly necessary to quote authority on

this point, but if authority is needed, we have that of the great hero of the free traders, Adam Smith. That eminent man wrote the "Wealth of Nations," a very remarkable book, containing much of great value, and pointing out the pathway to be pursued by enlightened selfishness in its search for national prosperity. That book has been widely read and greatly admired. Its author, however, looked upon it as covering only half of the scheme of human society and human action, for seventeen years before the publication of the "Wealth of Nations" he had written another book, which was complementary to the "Wealth of Nations," and which covered what that omitted. This earlier book he entitled "Moral Sentiments." It is quite forgotten now. I have never met a free trader who had read it, and very few who had heard of it. The "Moral Sentiments" have not proved as attractive as the methods of enlightened selfishness for getting rich, but the book demonstrates that Adam Smith knew that moral sentiments were not necessarily involved in a mere system of money-making, and established the distinction so broadly and clearly that he was justified, perhaps, in hoping that his followers and worshipers would understand it.

Let us rest, then, if we need to do so, on the authority of Adam Smith, that "moral sentiments" are a thing apart from the "wealth of nations," or from tariff policies merely as such. To suppose otherwise, indeed, is as great an error as another theory which I have seen advanced, to the effect that the American manufacturer is a "robber baron," who ought to be as destitute of rights as a black man under the Dred Scott decision, while the New York importer, generally of foreign birth and often with "no fatherland but the till," is a disinterested being so pure and good that if it were not for the imperfection of our earthly state

we might expect to see angel wings springing from his shoulders. The truth is that both are men with the usual supply of human nature and of enlightened selfishness about them, although I greatly prefer the American manufacturer, because his enlightened selfishness is more profitable to his own countrymen than that of the importer.

It is always well to look at things as they are, even if the thing be free trade, to which some persons in beautiful language have consecrated themselves. It is best, if we would treat it intelligently, to know that by itself and of itself the tariff is a business question, and that protection and free trade only take on a different and far deeper meaning when they are considered as parts of a question between far-reaching principles, which I believe involves the future of our race and the existence and progress of the highest civilization. It is in the latter and far graver aspect, as I have already said, that I prefer first to treat them.

To the practical man of affairs the theoretical and convinced free trader is generally extremely exasperating. But to the student of history and to the disinterested observer, to men of philosophic minds and blessed with a sense of humor, he is one of the most interesting and entertaining of human phenomena. These convinced free traders generally have some education, and invariably think that they have a great deal. They are provided with a set of little sayings and aphorisms, which can be carried without intellectual strain in a very small compass, and which to their thinking are complete solutions of all social and economic questions. These they draw forth on all occasions and present them to the world with entire confidence in the finality of their little sentences and a profound contempt for all persons who venture to differ

from them, and who do not think that the difficulties of humanity can be so easily dealt with. Their attitude reminds one of Touchstone, who, unlike them, was both a wit and a humorist, but who had a similar way of sententiously disposing of the troubles of mankind. Every one remembers the description of Touchstone by the melancholy Jaques:—

“ And then he drew a dial from his poke ;
And looking on it with lack-lustre eye,
Says, very wisely, “ It is ten o’clock ;
Thus we may see,” quoth he, “ how the world wags :
'T is but an hour since it was nine ;
And after an hour more 't will be eleven ;
And so, from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,
And then from hour to hour, we rot and rot
And thereby hangs a tale.’ ”

And so the free trader, not in the forest of Arden, but in the busy, eager days of the nineteenth century pulls out his little memorandum and says, “ The tariff is a tax.” “ You cannot become rich by taxing yourself any more than you can lift yourself by your boot-straps,” and so on, and so on. It is very interesting to know that there are men who really think that the complex affairs of humanity can be disposed of by a collection of epigrammatic half truths and watch-pocket memoranda, and who firmly believe that they can regulate the vast mechanism of modern society with a latch-key because that simple instrument suffices to open their own front doors. They are interesting, also, in another way, for, to use the expressive slang of the day, “ They know it all.” The curious thing about it is that they really do know it all, if by “ it ” you mean free trade. It is possible for any one to know everything about free trade, because its doctrines reached

maturity fifty years ago and have stood still ever since, untaught by history and unchanged by facts.

The only condition necessary to this complete knowledge, besides being able to read, is that you should know nothing else except free trade. You must close your eyes and shut your ears to everything that has happened since the time of the Manchester school; you must take English opinion as the ultimate expression of human wisdom, and then you know all about free trade, and that is all you will know. Thus the free trader and his doctrine stand stationary and immovable. You cannot affix to them Galileo's sentence, which an American wit declared to be the proper motto for Italian locomotives, "And yet it moves." There is no motion about the free trader or his doctrine. To him human wisdom culminated and found its complete expression in the free-trade measures of the Manchester school — doctrines which Thomas Carlyle irreverently christened "The Dismal Science" and the "Calico Millennium."

To the average free trader nothing has happened since. His mind is as tightly shut to new ideas or new facts as that of the average Englishman on the currency question, or as a rock barnacle at low tide. He still believes not only that his doctrine is as scientifically true as the law of gravitation, but that it is absolutely new, although it is wrinkled with age and bent by the failures of fifty years. When the astronomer, calculating the orbit of Uranus, finds perturbations for which no known conditions account, he reasons that there must be some hidden cause which is the origin of these uncalculated deviations. He observes and watches, and presently a new planet swims into his ken. His problem is solved, and he adjusts his calculations to meet the new conditions. Not so the

free trader. The orbits that he calculates are full of variations, and facts conflict with his theories. He folds his arms and says, "So much the worse for the facts if they do not conform to my doctrines." Look at anything they write or say, and you will find that they always begin by telling us what Sir Robert Peel did, what laws were passed in England from 1841 to 1846, or what Cobden said, or what were the views of the league against the corn laws. To them that was, and now is, both the beginning and end of all wisdom, and yet it was all a half-century back. Much has happened since then; many facts have appeared which contradict all their theories; many of their prophecies have failed of fulfillment. They neither know nor care. The world has been moving steadily forward, with many struggles and much suffering, along the dusty highroad of human progress ever since 1840; but the free trader, perched like a wee bird on the fence rail by the roadside, chirps and twitters his little song in bland unconsciousness of the great procession which has been marching steadily onward for fifty years in a direction quite different from that upon which the Manchester school decided that it must move.

Let us try, without prejudice, and frankly confessing the enormous complexity of the social and economic difficulties which face and perplex humanity — let us try, I say, to trace the course of the movement of mankind upon the great bottom principles involved in this question, and see whether we cannot get some light upon the particular phase of it which is now before us.

The breakdown of the feudal system was the defeat of the forces of separatism, disorder, and petty tyrannies. The force which prevailed over feudalism was that which made for order and the consolidation of power. Law and

order were in the interests of the Crown, which was the central authority, and of the great lower and middle classes of the population, who wished peace and quiet and who preferred one ruler to many. At the same time the great feudal nobility, with all their vices, had in their day acted as an important check upon the power of the Crown, and their overthrow meant the removal of this check. The danger to be apprehended from the destruction of the feudal system, a destruction so necessary to human progress, was that the central authority would become too powerful, and that for a tyrannous oligarchy would be substituted a personal despotism. On the continent of Europe, and in England as well, this was the line of development which followed upon the fall of the feudal system. The powers of the Crown began to grow with great rapidity, freed as they were from the resistance which the great nobles had formerly made, while the people were not ready to appreciate the situation or offer any opposition to the growth of royal power. In England the body of the people, who were by nature independent and impatient of control, soon learned their lesson. When the power of the Crown reached the point where Charles I undertook to set up a personal monarchy, the people were ready for the conflict. The great rebellion ensued, and all danger of the establishment of a personal despotism in England disappeared with the execution of Charles at Whitehall, and in the smoke of Cromwell's guns, when he won the "crowning mercy" at Worcester. From that period the English-speaking people everywhere have advanced steadily and with but little bloodshed to the complete control of their own governments.

On the continent of Europe the case was widely different. There, personal despotism was established almost un-

checked, and Louis XIV was able to say truthfully that he was an absolute King — that he was the State. Such a development could have but one result, and the abuses of despotism went on until no remedy remained but a social and political convulsion. This came in the French Revolution, which shook the civilized world from one end to the other and plunged all Europe into war for a quarter of a century. It revolutionized not only government and society, but thought and opinion as well, and we still feel its effects. These personal governments which then were overthrown were, of course, paternal in their character; that is, they interfered with the lives, the property, and the affairs of their subjects in every possible way. The physical revolt against them carried with it an intellectual revolt against state interference of any kind, and paternalism came to be regarded as the equivalent of the hideous despotisms which the French Revolution destroyed.

This confusion of these two ideas was natural, and perhaps at the time wholesome. In any event, it had an immense effect upon the philosophy and theory of government, for out of this period came the doctrine that the least government is the best, and the economic theory known as *laissez faire* and *laissez aller*. The pendulum under the influence of this great movement against personal government, as was to have been expected, swung with corresponding violence to the opposite extreme. Men swiftly concluded that, because the interference of the state under the monarchies of the eighteenth century was evil, the true secret of freedom, happiness, and success was to be found in going as far as possible in the opposite direction, in reducing government to its lowest terms, and in getting as near as possible to no government at all. In other words, the world in its political and economic theo-

ries rushed from the system of tyrannous interference by a personal government, under which it had sorely suffered, to extreme individualism and unrestrained competition as a sure haven where all would be peace, gentleness, and prosperity. All this was very natural, but, like all extremes, very dangerous, and, like all Utopias, was in practice very uncertain and disappointing. The theory that state interference is always and necessarily a wholly bad thing, of which we must have as little as possible, was in reality a too hasty generalization. It depended on the proposition that state interference and paternalism as shown in the case of a personal monarchy were wholly bad. On this precise state of facts the let-alone theory in politics rested, and from it the same theory in economical questions took its widest extension. The foundation was insecure, and the glittering formula soon began to break down. It could not do otherwise, for it depended on a half truth. Men began to perceive, as time went on and the steady progress of the democratic movement was assured, that there was more than one kind of state, and that it did not at all follow because the meddling tyranny of a personal monarchy was bad that the limited and intelligent interference of every other kind of government must be bad too. The wide difference between the action of a state composed of Louis XIV and a state composed of the people themselves began to be apparent. In proportion as this truth has grown visible to men, so has the reaction against state interference, which began at the close of the last century and culminated in the adoption of free trade by England, declined.

Except to the English free trader and his imitators in this country, for whom history ended fifty years ago, and to whom the observation of historic and economic facts which do not fit their theory appears a mere impertinence,

this change of opinion and advance of knowledge are very obvious. Men and nations have alike discovered that unrestrained individualism and unrestricted competition are capable of producing a social system quite as cruel and oppressive as the darkest forms of feudalism, to which some free-trade orators are fond of likening protection, apparently with the notion that feudalism was an economic policy. Having made this discovery, men have revolted against the doctrine which denied that any relief could be obtained by invoking the strength of the whole community united in government to remedy the glaring evils and miseries which unrestricted individualism and unrestrained competition were helpless to modify or cure. This revolt has been successful at various points, yet its importance rests not on its success, but on the fact that the let-alone theory has in this way been proved to be unsound in many directions. This fact is fatal, for if the general let-alone doctrine is not sound and correct at all points, it cannot be assumed to be correct at any. It is no longer sufficient to say that any given social or economic policy rests on the let-alone theory, for that theory has broken down completely as a general truth, and therefore no part of it, and no expression of it, is necessarily correct. Free trade rests entirely on the let-alone doctrine — that is, upon the doctrine that the least interference of the state is best; or, in other words, that the state ought not to interfere at all in the affairs of its individual members, except to maintain order at home or abroad, or in defense of public morals and public health; and even these are logically infractions of the doctrine of absolute individualism. Free trade, comparatively speaking, is not a very large question. It is merely the expression in one limited direction of a much broader principle. If the let-alone theory is correct

as a general economic principle, and if the experience and practice of mankind show that it is correct, then free trade is of course correct as one of its parts. But if, on the other hand, the let-alone doctrine can be proved in many directions to be incorrect, if it has been abandoned again and again in practice by the most civilized nations, then the presumption is against free trade or any other single expression of the central principle. Let us see, first, how far this let-alone doctrine has been invaded since it found its last expression in England a half-century ago.

In the direction of free trade itself the case is very readily summed up. England has maintained that tariff system since she adopted it. France, under the Second Empire, perhaps the worst government which that country has ever had, made a spasmodic effort to imitate England's example. It was, however, quickly abandoned, and France is to-day a country of high protection. It may be added that France is the strongest country in the world, except our own and Great Britain, both financially and economically. The wealth of the people was demonstrated in a most marvelous manner when the French, out of their own savings, paid the enormous indemnity to Germany after the Franco-Prussian war, so that to-day the public debt of France is practically held by her own citizens. Without going further into details, it may be said that no civilized nation has adopted the English system. All are protectionist countries. Even England's own colonies, where her doctrines might be supposed to have peculiar strength, have all, one after another, abandoned the free-trade system and are to-day protectionist. I am quite aware that the free trader sets aside all opinion that is not English as quite worthless, but I do not think that intelligent persons who are unswayed by the provincial subservience to English opinion charac-

teristic of most American free traders can afford to do this. The general opinion of mankind to which Jefferson appealed in the Declaration of Independence must always be regarded, and has great weight in determining what men think is practically best for their respective countries. If that opinion is considered, it shows that the experience and the practice of civilized men are adverse to the let-alone doctrine as expressed in free trade.

But, as I have said already, free trade is only a part of a principle; and if free trade is founded upon the rock of everlasting truth, the doctrine of which it is the expression must hold good in every direction. Looked at in this way, the practical abandonment of the theory, which is proof that it is not an economic truth and that it does not in human opinion work beneficially, is overwhelming. It is not necessary to enter into the long list of legislation, which in its very being flatly contradicts the soundness of the let-alone doctrine. A very few examples will suffice. I will take England for consideration, because England is still the great exemplar of the theory. If the let-alone theory is correct, why does England pass factory acts and mine acts? It may be said that this is done for moral or sanitary reasons, but this explanation is insufficient. It is perhaps possible to stretch it so as to cover the labor of young children, but it certainly cannot cover the regulation of the hours of labor for adults. It is a monstrous invasion of the let-alone doctrine to say that it is economically correct for government to interfere with the number of hours that a man or woman should work either in mines or factories. Surely, under that doctrine people should have the right to sell their labor when and how they please. Yet the English government is interfering in this precise direction, and the free trader does not live in England who is hardy enough

to rise up and demand the repeal of these acts because they interfere with individual freedom or the doctrine on which free trade is founded. At this very moment the English Parliament is discussing the employers' liability act. Either the let-alone doctrine is radically unsound, or this legislation is as gross an invasion of it as ever was attempted. On the theory of the free trader, what right has the government to interfere between the employer and the employed? By so doing they set at naught one of their most precious shibboleths of "supply and demand." Yet the Liberal party, led until recently by the venerable statesman who believed that all financial and economic knowledge culminated fifty years ago in the Manchester school, is endeavoring to force through this very act of employers' liability. What becomes of the let-alone doctrine in the Irish land legislation, where the government takes land from the landlord and sells it to the tenant? No greater interference of government was ever undertaken, no more gaping breach in the let-alone theory was ever made; yet both political parties in Great Britain have supported or enforced in turn this land legislation of Ireland.

Let us come a little nearer to free trade. There is no form of protection so extreme as a bounty. Yet England has fostered and built up her shipping by a system of bounties, under the name of mail subsidies, which has been of the most extreme character. I shall give elsewhere a table which shows in detail what she has done in this direction. It is enough to say here that from 1848 to 1889, inclusive, England spent in mail subsidies \$190,027,789. It is perfectly idle, it is worse than begging the question, to say that these are not protective bounties because they are called mail subsidies. To pretend, indeed, that these subsidies are not protection in a high form is not merely a subterfuge,

it is a pure falsehood. Such vast sums for such a purpose are an absurdity on any other theory. If proof were needed of their true character, it may be found in the discussion which arose when, under the last administration, we entered on a policy of mail subsidies and the encouragement of American steamships as an auxiliary naval force. Our measures were identical with those of England; the Republican party adopted them as measures of protection to develop our merchant marine, and would not have enacted them if they had not been of that character. All the American free traders who had been eagerly saying that England did not protect her commerce or give it bounties, that she only paid mail subsidies, cried out against our mail subsidies as another example of Republican protection. If England's mail subsidies are not protective bounties, then ours were not, and they should have been cordially supported by English-minded and free-trade persons in this country. But our mail subsidies were protective, and so are England's; and no one knew it so well as England, who found in our policy fresh cause of hostility to the Republican and of affection for the Democratic party. The only difference between the two systems was that we honestly declared our subsidies to be protection, while England canted about hers, in order that the faith of those who work in her interests in other countries might not be shaken. If you would have further light on this, contrast what we have paid for carrying the mails with what England has paid, and you will see what the actual cost of mail transportation is. The vast sums spent by England in addition to the actual cost of mail transportation are protective bounties, and high at that. I think her policy in this direction has been very wise. While she maintains free trade, because she thinks it will pay, and proclaims in the name of truth and

righteousness that everybody else should have free trade and open their markets to her goods because she knows that will pay, too, she is very careful to use protection in its most extreme form where she is sure that it will pay her best of all. Nothing is more laughable, it may be said in this connection, than to see the way in which the convinced American free trader is taken in by this English cant shrewdly used for business purposes. England is always talking in a strident voice about her generosity and her anxiety that other nations should adopt this or that system because it will be beneficial to them. The truth is that England as a nation is selfish, as every other nation is. She masks her selfishness in loud protestations of complete disinterestedness, but why anybody who was not born in England should believe these protestations I have never been able to see. If, however, her general theory on which she rests free trade is correct, then her system of subsidies for steamship lines is all wrong. If the theory is incorrect, as she proves it in practice, then it does not lie in the mouth of the nation which protects commerce to talk about the eternal verity of her free-trade policy.

You can find laws in other civilized countries similar to those in England to which I have referred, but I will not dwell upon them. I will come nearer home. The public-school system and the post office are absolute violations of the let-alone theory. Yet who disputes their value, or who proposes to give them up? In almost every State of the Union there are statutes regulating the hours of labor, employers' liability, the management of railroads, and a thousand other acts great and small which interfere more or less directly with all the force of the government in the affairs of individuals. It is the same with the nation as with the states. Our statute book is filled with provi-

sions which utterly disregard the let-alone theory of government, and every time we dredge a harbor or deepen a river or open a canal we set it at naught.

There is no need to go on and pile up examples. They occur every day, and stare at us from every page of our constitutions and statutes. If the let-alone doctrine on which free trade rests is correct, then these laws, from those providing for public education down, are all wrong. They should be swept from the statute books. In the jargon of the Democratic orator, they are fetters upon freedom. They set at defiance the darling epigrams that the free trader carries in his pocket and produces year in and year out, with the comfortable belief that they are both new and true, instead of being the damaged utterances of half a century ago. Let us look for a moment at two of these precious aphorisms, these beautiful expressions of the let-alone doctrine to the effect that you must "buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market," and that everything must be settled by the unrestrained and unqualified economic law of supply and demand. Let us see how these profound antitheses bear the test of actual legislation in the United States. We have upon our statute books at this moment a law to prevent the importation of contract labor, a law very imperfectly enforced, I am sorry to say. What put that law upon the statute book? The demand of the laboring men of the United States that they should be protected against that form of competition. The workingmen of the United States called for and secured this legislation in order to prevent the lowering of their rates of wages by the introduction of large masses of labor, which brought with them by contract the rate of wages of other countries where wages were lower than in the United States. On what portion

of the let-alone doctrine do you rest the economic correctness of these laws, supported by both political parties and questioned in their soundness by no one? If the free-trade doctrine be sound, by what principle do you step in and say to the employers of the United States, "You shall not buy your labor in the cheapest market"? If that principle of buying in the cheapest market is a sound principle, it is just as applicable to a manufacturer or to any employer of labor as it is to any one else. But we properly deny them the unrestricted right because in this instance we recognize in practice that the doctrine is absurd. No grosser violation of the general principle on which free trade rests can be found than this, and yet there is not a Democrat or a free trader with any responsibility who would dare to rise in this Senate or anywhere else and ask for the repeal of these contract-labor laws. If the let-alone principle is right, these laws are wrong. If these laws are right, — and they are thoroughly right, — then the let-alone principle is fatally wrong in that direction; and if it is wrong in one direction, there is no reason to assume that it is right in any other.

Take another case. Some years ago, in response to the workingmen of California, this country entered upon a policy of Chinese exclusion. The men who began it were denounced. The scholars, the economists, the philanthropists, the professors, the colleges, at the start were all against it; but the workingmen triumphed, and to-day no party and no representative of any party dares to suggest the free admission of the Chinese. I have heard free traders say that we kept out the Chinese because they were not clean and their habits were not good. Never in the world was there a great popular uprising to keep men

out of a country because they were dirty or because their habits were unattractive. The trouble was that the Chinese brought with them a rate of wages with which our workingmen with their standard of living could not compete. The instinct of the laboring men of California was right. They saw in the Chinaman a competitor who would drag them down. They demanded his exclusion, and we shut him out. Australia, an English colony, where the labor organizations have exercised a greater influence perhaps than anywhere in the world — Australia, too, has shut him out. How do you make it agree with the doctrine of buying in the cheapest market to exclude the Chinese labor from this country? In China, as the cheapest labor market and the greatest reservoir of low-priced labor in the world, on the theory of free trade we should have the right to buy our labor; and yet everybody is agreed that it is well to put a stop to it by law. What becomes of the precious theory of free trade in the face of a fact like that? We are right to exclude the Chinaman, who brings his cheap labor with him and lowers our standard of living and degrades our working people. If it is right to do so, then by what theory do you admit free of duty the product of this same Chinaman made in his own country to compete with our product here? The product brings its rate of wages with it just as much as the man, and ocean freight no longer gives protection. If it is right to exclude the Chinaman, it is right to exclude the chair cane which he makes, and which brings his rate of wages and standard of life to compete with our workingmen just as surely as if the Chinaman came over himself and made his chair cane in New York or Philadelphia. The underlying proposition of the free trader is that it is idle to attempt to modify by legislation the working of

immutable economic laws. He forgets, or has never learned, that scarcely anything is immutable into which enter the heart and mind and emotions of humanity. The personal equation plays a large part in all things which human beings affect by their own actions. "Raise wages by law, make yourself richer by taxation," says the free trader, bringing out again his little collection of epigrams. "It is like lifting yourselves by your boot straps." And then he fancies that he has answered the whole case. And while he thinks he has settled the universe in this simple fashion, the plain sense of the American workingmen has shut out Chinese labor and contract labor, and will in no long time shut out the imported products of that same labor.

Let us pass beyond the action of the government in regard to the let-alone theory, and consider the action of men. Let us look for a moment at the attitude of the individual man when the let-alone doctrine meets him in practice. Do workingmen wait and rely upon the operation of these so-called economic laws on which free trade rests to regulate their affairs? They combine, as they ought to combine, to bring about an increase in their wages, to elevate their own condition, to prevent by artificial means destructive competition. Every labor union that is formed flies in the face of the doctrine of free trade. But, none the less, men are going to form them. They wield to-day a vast power, they will keep on growing, and they exist because they represent the instinct of human nature to unite for self-protection. No free trader dares to denounce them as infractions of his theory. His theory, then, is either false or cowardly when it faces a trades union; in reality it is both. I am aware that one wiseacre, repeating what another wiseacre has said, will reply,

“You admit labor free while you cry for protection against manufactured goods.” It is almost as easy to answer this statement as to make it. In the first place, it is not true that we admit all labor free. Some we exclude absolutely, like contract and Chinese labor. In the second place, the labor that we do admit free comes from Europe, and the immigrant from Europe does not bring his rate of wages with him. On the contrary, a few weeks or a few months make him as anxious for good wages as his American brethren. Our standard of living becomes his, and he ceases to lower our rate of living and modes of life. The European immigrant does not bring his rate of wages with him; but the bale of goods from Europe does bring its rate of wages, and the bale of goods is not susceptible to the influences of association or to standards of living. The bale of goods brings its rate of wages with it and keeps it, and works in that way towards the lowering of all American rates. Lastly, it is no argument to say that because you do not have protection in one direction where it would be good, you should give it up in another where it is also good. So I freely admit that our failure to give suitable protection against the labor which comes in the human being is a grave defect. The principle embodied in the contract-labor law should be enlarged, because the protection we now give by the duty on the bale of goods should be extended. There is no greater need at this time than stringent laws to sift and restrict the immigration to this country for the protection of our rates of wages and of the quality of our citizenship. This protection against excessive European immigration will come, as the exclusion of the Chinese and contract labor came, from the good sense and unerring instinct of the people, which will lead them to measures to guard their homes, their future, their race, and their civi-

lization against forms of competition which they cannot meet if it is left unrestricted.

What, then, becomes of a doctrine which all the legislatures in the world continually disregard? What becomes of a doctrine with a hundred violations staring it in the face from every statute book, violations which even its devotees support or accept? What becomes of a doctrine that the instinct of mankind in his efforts for improvement sets at naught? All history proves that the let-alone doctrine cannot stand the shock of facts or the ordeal of practice. The truth is that in these modern times the civilized world is entering upon a new period. The temperate zone, in which experience shows that the most highly civilized races, to which we belong, can alone thrive and multiply, is very nearly absorbed. There is still much to be converted to the uses of man, but the limits are well within sight. Over against us are the crowded masses of the tropics. Relieved in many instances by the rule of our superior races from the effect of the wars, famines, and floods which formerly decimated them, they are multiplying with enormous rapidity. In Natal, for example, when the English first took possession, the proportion of blacks to whites was something like three to one. To-day, under the strong British rule, and after a large British immigration, the blacks are to the whites as thirteen to one. The same rule holds good everywhere, and the crowded masses of the tropical regions are becoming ever more crowded. They have standards far below ours. They live under conditions of climate and habits impossible to us. Millions of men in India subsist on from fourteen to twenty dollars a year, and those men in India as well as in Japan are beginning to manufacture, thus closing to us their own markets and threatening our markets with an industrial competition

which is deadly if you do not shut it out. You may lower wages and reduce costs beyond the wildest dreams of the free-trade orator, and in this temperate zone, where we and those like us dwell, you never can meet that tropical standard of living. Are we to sit down with our great civilization and bring about free trade, in order to be gradually overwhelmed by the labor of the tropics after a desperate struggle with the overcrowded people of our own race in Europe? Are we to be told that the laws of supply and demand, of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest markets, are eternal truths, and that everything would be right if we only adhered to them? Are we to accept these shattered dogmas of fifty years ago, and yield without a struggle to the ruin of our labor and the degradation of our standards of living?

Very fortunately there is a sound instinct in the great races who have made civilization, which protects them from such visions as these. They will not submit; they have already begun to resist. They have excluded the Chinaman from Australia and the United States. They will exclude every sort of low labor brought by the man himself, and they will in process of time equalize that same labor with their own by proper duties, when it is brought down the ship's gangway, not in the form of a human being, but in the form of a bale of goods, and carrying the same low rate of wages. The law of self-preservation is a higher law than any that political economy has ever invented, and, although it is the outcome of human nature, it is immutable. That law will in the lapses of the years, if not now, give us the protection which the free trader playing with his wrinkled little puppets would deny.

The fundamental error of the supporters of the let-alone theory, as I have already said, is that they believe that

what they call economic laws are fixed and certain, like those which govern the motions of the stars. But, although men, like stars, may differ from one another in glory, they are unlike stars in most other respects. Laws which are grounded upon the action of humanity are not fixed, but empirical. With rare exceptions, the most that we can hope for in this field is an approximation, some general rule with many exceptions. Human policies of society or government are subject to infinite variations. That which is most wise at one time may be most unwise at another. That which is excellent for one people would be ruin to another. Soil, climate, situation, the size of the country, the race and character of the people, the conditions of the moment, and the possibilities of the future must all be considered in the adoption of any policy. The states and the people who have recognized this great controlling truth, and have put *a priori* theories behind them, have been the successful and governing races of the world. The Abbé Sieyès drew one ideal constitution after another for France. They were all perfect in theory, and they all perished from the face of the earth. Washington and his associates made but one constitution. It embodied few theories and much practice. It had inconsistencies and compromises, but it met the wants of the time and of the people, and it has stood strong and flourishing for a hundred years. The free trader is like the French Abbé; he would bind human development in the tight bandages of a theory, without regard to the infinite complexity of all things pertaining to humanity. He may by so doing attain symmetry, but it will be the symmetry of the Egyptian mummy, and the result will be quite as lifeless. That which applies to constitutions and government applies also to economic policies. We must look for guidance not to

closet theories, but to the great book of history and experience, and see what has been done and attempted and what results have been achieved. Men are learning the lessons of history. They have long since put those lessons into practice. They are now beginning to formulate them as a theory, and to understand the philosophy which underlies them. It is apparent to all whose eyes are not hermetically sealed by the traditions of a fading past that, because a personal monarchy or state socialism is bad and oppressive, it does not therefore follow that unrestrained individualism and unrestricted competition are always and everywhere the only good things. Because some state interference is hurtful, all forms of it are not necessarily so. It is a question of degree, not of kind. Somewhere between the extremes of unlimited individualism on the one hand and personal monarchy or state socialism on the other can be found the golden mean, in which it is possible to use the united power of the community expressed in the state for the benefit of mankind and the protection of civilization.

Just how far we can go profitably in the use or in the refusal to use the powers of the state can be determined only by patient and cautious experiment, through which all the slow steps of civilization have been thus far painfully won. It is no doubt true that it is a grievous mistake to suppose that we can cure by law every evil which afflicts humanity, and that it is a weakness to look helplessly to legislation for everything we desire. But it is equally true, and has been proved in practice, that legislation and government can in many cases be employed with advantage to help the affairs of men. In other words, the aggregate power of the community can sometimes bring beneficial results which individuals by their divided efforts

can never reach. If it be said, as it always is said, that this is a futile attempt to overbear natural laws by artificial devices, the answer is that the so-called economic laws are neither natural nor final; that statute law can often modify or call into action economic laws, and is constantly doing so, and that the whole fabric of human civilization to which those supposed laws are thought to apply is artificial. If we put away from us everything that is artificial, everything which man has established by means of law and custom, we should sink back to the condition of the men of the caves and the river drift.

As we see those animals whose instinct compels them to live in society and obey a chief are most capable of improvement, so it is with races of mankind. Whether we look at it as a cause or a consequence, the more civilized always have the most artificial governments. In Tierra del Fuego, until some chief shall arise with power sufficient to secure any acquired advantage, such as the domesticated animals, it seems scarcely possible that the political state of the country can be improved.¹

These are the words of Charles Darwin, a very great man, and one who has exercised a more profound influence upon human thought than probably any man who has lived in the nineteenth century. He marks here as characteristic of savages in the very lowest scale of humanity an absolutely unrestrained individualism, and points out that all civilization is highly artificial. Speaking with the unimpassioned voice of science, he formulates a great truth.

Everything that we have which makes up our civilization is the outcome of custom hardened into law and public opinion, or of law, pure and simple, embodying the aspira-

¹ Darwin, *Voyage of the Beagle*, vol. i, p. 296.

tions and the hopes of men. Government and property, the sanctity of the family, the bonds of marriage, the education of children, the punishment of crimes, are all artificial, the slow upbuilding by man through ages of weary experiment and disheartening failures. From the most sacred rights of humanity to trivial questions of manners and of dress, all is artificial; all is the work of man's brains seeking to do by the concentrated force of society what the poor scattered atoms of individuals could never accomplish alone. In view of the marvelous work which men by their union with other men have been able to achieve, how pitiful is a doctrine which would hold that this united force, which has raised us slowly from the deep darkness of prehistoric times, must be reduced to its lowest proportions, and that the less we employ the agency which has raised us, the better it will be for us. How more than absurd to stand in the midst of civilization, the work of our hands, artificial throughout, created by men acting in large masses and represented by states and governments, and say that the laws of that civilization made in this way and with such a history demand the absolute negation and abandonment of the very power which created the entire fabric, merely because that power is capable of abuse and can be forced to an evil extreme, like personal despotism or state socialism. It is a marvel that such a doctrine should have had any measure of success for fifty years even in theory, for it has never been accepted, except in a small degree, by any people in practice. Men have always employed their united force, which for convenience we call the state, sometimes wisely, sometimes unwisely, to secure or to try to secure ends for which their individual strength was unequal. There has never been a time when they have not

done so. There never will be ; for the instinct which first united a band of naked savages for mutual defense is undying, and is as strong to-day as ever, and far more intelligent. The let-alone theory, as a complete guide, when tried by the broad history of man, fails utterly. It has no support. Tried even by the standards of the limited application of it attempted in this century in new directions it fails, and can have no other fate, for it gives the lie to all that men have done and suffered in order to reach the point they have now attained, and sets at naught all the teachings of history. If, then, as I have said, the general doctrine breaks down, no single expression of it can stand except on its own merits. The general doctrine of let-alone in government has been invaded, abandoned, and disproved in hundreds of cases ever since it reached its highest point fifty years ago. Free trade is one expression of the let-alone doctrine. The general theory cannot sustain it. It must, therefore, stand on its own merits alone as one expression of a principle broken at a hundred points, and must prove, by the benefits it confers, its right to exist as an exception to the great law of human development through which all civilization has been reached.

The next point, therefore, is to determine whether free trade, contrary as it is to the general principles on which human society has been built up, can justify its existence. We can settle this by examining the results of free trade ; and, as only one civilized country has adopted it, that is easily done. England did not take up free trade because she was suddenly convinced of its scientific truth and believed that it ought therefore to prevail, even if the heavens fell. She adopted it, as nations generally adopt an economic policy, because she was satisfied, after much discussion, that it would pay. It is important to us to know

under what conditions she adopted it, whether our conditions are like hers, and whether in the long run free trade has proved such a benefit to England as to make it obvious that it must be beneficial to every other nation. First, as to the conditions. England is a small country, with a limited agricultural area and no great variety of natural resources. The United States is a very large country, with an enormous agricultural area and an almost unequaled variety of natural resources. The population of England fifty years ago was dense. It is still denser to-day. The population of the United States at large, tried by European standards, is sparse. Thus we see at the outset that the natural conditions, and those of population also, in England and the United States are wholly different. At the time of the free-trade movement England had been living and had built up her industries and her merchant marine under a system of high protection, which had endured for centuries. All the industries, practically, which she could hope to have were firmly established, and the skilled labor necessary to carry them on had been developed. We, on the other hand, have had protection of a varying kind, and with some large intervals of low tariff, for less than a century. Many of our industries are not yet firmly established nor the necessary labor for them fully developed, while many others, to the flourishing existence of which there are no natural obstacles, do not exist at all. England invented the steam engine, and in 1840 had carried the application of steam power to industrial production far beyond the point reached at that time by any other nation. This lead in the application of steam power gave her an enormous advantage in cheapness of production, and put her far beyond the reach of competition. We to-day have no such advantage, for the applica-

tion of steam power to industrial production is now at the equal command of all the great civilized nations.

The most important difference, however, still remains to be considered. England to-day and fifty years ago was unable to feed herself. She was obliged to import food products or starve her people. At the same time she had corn laws, which levied a heavy tax on the great food staples. This tax — for, as I shall presently show, it was not a protective duty — benefited only the land owners of England, a small and in the main an aristocratic and very rich class. It put a heavy burden upon all the people of England, and especially upon the industrial classes. The great popular agitation, which ended with the establishment of free trade, began in the attack on the corn laws, and at the time the repeal of the corn laws was regarded as the leading feature of the free-trade movement. In reality that repeal was demanded, and would be demanded to-day as part of the policy of protection. The protectionist theory is to discriminate by duties in favor of every article which can be grown or manufactured in the protected country in sufficient quantities for the use of the people ; and everything which cannot be grown or manufactured in sufficient quantities, according to the protectionist should be placed upon the free list. Wheat could not be raised in England in sufficient quantities to feed her people. There was no ground for giving a bounty, as has been done so largely by European nations to stimulate the production of sugar, for it was a physical impossibility to raise corn and wheat beyond certain well-defined limits. A certain proportion of food products had to be imported, and, as the importation could not be avoided, there was no possibility of lowering the prices by developing a home competition, and the duties imposed

became a direct tax which no one could escape. Therefore, according to the protectionist theory, better understood to-day than it was then, the English corn laws ought to have been swept away long before it was actually done. There is no defense for their existence in protection. If it is possible to defend a tax upon food products which cannot be raised in the country in sufficient quantities for its needs, that defense is not to be found in protection, but in free trade, which in England to-day taxes coffee and tea. Hence it follows that the repeal of the corn laws, which established free trade in England, has absolutely no bearing on the question now before us, except as an example of the soundness of the protectionist theory. Moreover, it must be remembered that we are in no way dependent, as England was, on outside supplies of food products. We not only raise all we need and all we ever shall be likely to need, but we are large exporters. There is still another side to this matter, which must not be passed over, as it has an important bearing upon the action of England. The English manufacturer had reached the point where the miseries of the industrial population were such that it was necessary either to raise wages or to run the risk of revolution, which was foreshadowed in the Chartist movement. The English manufacturer raised wages by repealing the corn laws, and thus cheapening the food supply. It was an easy matter to excite popular feeling against the corn laws, for there never was a subject so susceptible of successful popular agitation. The class against which it was directed and which benefited by the corn laws was unpopular, numerically small, and, although still powerful, was so crippled politically by the reform bill of 1832 that it could not oppose a successful resistance. The manufacturer raised his wages at the ex-

pense of the English landowner. The industrial population was directly benefited. The manufacturer was not obliged to increase wages out of his own pocket, and the farmer and the agricultural laborer were no worse off, because the corn laws were not protective duties to them and they received none of the benefit which accrued to the comparatively few landowners of England. The manufacturers, having carried their point on the corn laws, and with a full sense of the advantage of their position owing to centuries of protection and to their early application of steam power, were not only ready but willing to remove all other duties, believing that their home market was safe, and that free trade would give a wider circulation and hence an increased value to their products.

Thus it was that the manufacturers of England with practical unanimity petitioned Parliament for the removal of all protective duties. These English manufacturers did not take this step because they thought that a scientific truth ought to prevail, but because they believed it to be for their own best interests in the direction of a money profit. Their opinion deserved to be, and was, regarded by Parliament. Contrast their attitude with that of our own manufacturers to-day. Our manufacturers with practical unanimity favor protection, and are opposed to free trade, and their opinion ought to be regarded by us as of great importance in the wisest business settlement of this question. The reply to this always is that our manufacturers sustain protection because they are selfish and make money by it. It is undoubtedly true that the manufacturer sustains protection because he hopes to make money. That is the object of business, and the number of persons who are in business with any other purpose is, I think, extremely small. If, however, the American

manufacturer does not make money, it is quite certain that he will not employ labor, and therefore the workingmen will not make money either. Our manufacturers believe that under free trade they must either go out of business or reduce labor costs. They naturally do not care to do the former, for that is ruin; and they are very unwilling to try the latter, because reducing labor costs means lowering wages, which means in turn vast industrial disturbances; and that is ruin too, or something very near it. How widely different is our situation to-day from that of England fifty years ago, so far as the manufacturers are concerned! Most striking of all these differences, moreover, is the fact that, while the English Parliament listened to English manufacturers, a majority of the American Congress not only turns a deaf ear to American manufacturers, but treats them as if they were enemies of their country.

Having found that the conditions in England at the time of the adoption of free trade were wholly unlike our conditions here to-day, it now remains to inquire whether the English policy has produced results which make it beyond question the proper policy for every other country. After the adoption of free trade those who brought it about immediately proclaimed, in the fashion of the English when they have entered upon some scheme which they think profitable, that the new system was a great and eternal truth; that every other nation ought to adopt it; that every one who did not agree with them was either vicious or ignorant, and probably both. This outcry had but little effect upon other nations, but in the United States there is a class of persons who are still intellectually in the colonial stage of development, and who are sadly distressed by any disagreement with the views of England. Hence

has arisen among us a free-trade propaganda. It was sustained at first by the existence of slave labor, which condemned a large section of our country to the production of a single great staple, and which, where it flourished, checked all industrial development. With the fall of slavery the gospel of free trade passed out of sight, and only in late years has it regained some of its lost ground. But now that, sustained by a desire for sectional retaliation, it again has a political standing, we have a right to demand, when it asks us to imitate the British policy, an exhibition of British results.

I have referred to the acclamation with which the adoption of free trade was hailed in England. The clamor grew so loud that it seemed as if one general feeling of delight and satisfaction pervaded the whole people. The classes who were directly benefited, or thought they were benefited, by free trade were loudly vocal, while the masses were silent. Yet with all this apparent unanimity, one of the greatest men then living in England, unbribed by mercantile profits, unawed by the noise of Birmingham and Manchester, and looking with prescient eyes beyond the passing day, announced to the unheeding world about him that there was no divine salvation in free trade. Here is what Thomas Carlyle said in the very heyday of the Manchester school, and his words may well be pondered, as showing how far short the new movement came, even at that moment, of fulfilling its promises:—

The world, with its Wealth of Nations, Supply and Demand, and such like, has of late days been terribly inattentive to that question of work and wages. We will not say the poor world has retrograded even here; we will say rather, the world has been rushing on with such fiery animation to get work and ever more work done, it has had no time to think of dividing the

wages; and has merely left them to be scrambled for by the law of the stronger, law of supply and demand, law of *laissez faire*, and other idle laws and un-laws, saying, in its dire haste to get the work done, "That is well enough."¹

All this dire misery, therefore; all this of our poor workhouse workmen, of our chartisms, trade strikes, corn laws, Toryisms, and the general downbreak of *laissez faire* in these days — may we not regard it as a voice from the dumb bosom of nature, saying to us: "Behold, supply and demand is not the one law of nature; cash payment is not the sole nexus of man with man — how far from it! Deep, far deeper than supply and demand, are laws, obligations, sacred as man's life itself; these also, if you will continue to do work, you shall now learn and obey. He that will learn them, behold, Nature is on his side; he shall yet work and prosper with noble rewards. He that will not learn them, Nature is against him; he shall not be able to do work in Nature's empire — not in hers. Perpetual mutiny, contention, hatred, isolation, execration, shall wait on his footsteps, till all men discern that the thing which he attains, however golden it look to be, is not success, but the want of success."²

With our present system of individual Mammonism and government by *laissez faire*, this nation cannot live. And if in the priceless interim some new life and healing be not found, there is no second respite to be counted on. The shadow on the dial advances thenceforth without pausing. What can government do? This that they call "organizing labor" is, if well understood, the problem of the whole future, for all who will in future pretend to govern men.³

England has many more doubters of the truth of free trade now than she had then. If Thomas Carlyle were to come back to life, instead of crying in the wilderness against the "calico millennium," he would find many allies even in his native land. Among others, no less a person

¹ *Past and Present*, p. 26.

² *Id.* p. 232.

³ *Id.* p. 318.

than a late prime minister of England, Lord Salisbury, who has not hesitated to sneer in public at the dogmas of free trade. And if Carlyle were to look across the North Sea to the land of one of his heroes, he would find another German, Prince Bismarck, worthy to stand by the side of the great Frederick, declaring that the prosperity of the United States was largely due to the policy of protection, and himself embodying that policy in the legislation of the mighty empire which he has created. According to the Manchester school, free trade was to become straightway universal, and was to bring in the place of war peace on earth and good will among men. Free trade has not become universal, for no nation but England has adopted it, and England herself has had a war on her hands on an average of about once a year ever since. As prophets of peace and universal free trade, the Manchester school has been a failure.

Let us turn now to the immediate effect upon England. That the repeal of the corn laws, which was in accordance with protectionist theories, was of great benefit to the English industrial population cannot be questioned. But the important point is to know whether free trade by itself has been able to maintain wages and to keep the working people of England more contented and better provided than they are elsewhere. On this subject I propose to quote the testimony of Mr. J. C. Fielden before the royal commission on the precious metals in 1887. Mr. Fielden is a peculiarly valuable witness, for he is an expert on the subject of labor, a free trader, and attributes the facts to which he testifies solely to the currency question. Mr. Fielden went into a cotton mill at thirteen years of age, and in 1887 he had been connected with the cotton trade for thirty-six years. He is a cotton manufacturer, the

manager of a large mercantile business in Manchester, has been connected with all movements in the cotton districts among the working classes since 1859, and has also been the arbitrator for the operatives in all the great wage questions where the question has been settled by arbitration.

From Mr. Fielden's testimony, drawn as it is from the secretaries of the great labor organizations and from manufacturers, and which cannot be questioned, we find that during the last twenty years there has been a serious decline in wages in England, amounting to from 12 to 15 per cent, and a large falling off in business. In this country, during the same period, the Aldrich report shows that there has been an advance in industrial wages of about 14 per cent. Mr. Fielden attributes the decline in England to the demonetization of silver, which on his theory affected wages and prices all over the world. Yet our wages, assuming that Mr. Fielden is correct in his theory, despite this currency difficulty, which was pushing them downward all the time, nevertheless rose 14 per cent.

Thus we see that if it is the abandonment of silver which has forced down wages and prices, free trade was helpless to resist the decline, while in the United States protection was able not only to resist the adverse force, but to keep wages on an ascending scale. During the debates of last summer many free traders who were eagerly supporting the gold standard claimed that it had not lowered prices, because wages in the United States had been rising since 1873. They are, therefore, estopped from now denying the fact of the rise. On the other hand, the friends of silver met this argument, drawn from our increasing wages, by saying that they formed an exception to the general decline on account of the labor organizations and the pro-

protective tariff, both infractions of the let-alone theory on which free trade rests. If, however, we assume that Mr. Fielden's theory as to the cause of the decline is incorrect, and that it had nothing to do with the state of the currency, then we find that during the last twenty years English wages have gone down 15 per cent under free trade, while American wages have risen 14 per cent under protection. It makes no difference whether we accept Mr. Fielden's view as to silver, or deny, with the gold monometallist, that silver had anything to do with the general decline of wages in England. So far as the question of free trade or protection is concerned, the result is the same and in favor of protection. If silver caused declining wages, the statistics show that protection was able to resist the decline. If silver had nothing to do with the decline in wages, then, according to statistics, wages have been rising for twenty years past under American protection and falling under English free trade. I will not bring forward any additional testimony in support of the evidence of Mr. Fielden. There is no need to do so. The general facts more than sustain all the details. The London dock strike of a few years ago, followed as it was last summer by the strike of 300,000 miners, against a reduction of wages, demonstrates the continued decline of wages in England. No general decline of wages took place in the United States until the protective tariff was threatened with destruction. Most significant of all is the fact that the stream of immigration flows from England to the United States. English immigrants come here to better their condition, and the instinct which leads them to do so is conclusive proof that the people who live by wages know them to be higher in protected America than in free-trade England. Thus we see that in fifty years free trade has proved utterly

unable to maintain wages in England, much less to increase them. At this point, also, free trade as a practical system has broken down.

Turn from industry to agriculture. Has English agriculture benefited by free trade, as Cobden and others of his school predicted? It is a matter of public notoriety that the record of agriculture in England of late years is little but a record of disaster. It is estimated that 2,500,000 acres of land have been driven out of cultivation. Rents have fallen from 30 to 50 per cent, and the market value of farming land has decreased in like proportion. In 1862, England grew 17,000,000 quarters of wheat, and in 1892, 7,000,000 quarters. Within six months the landowners and farmers of Essex have been obliged to reduce the wages of their laborers to 8s. a week. How would our farmers and farm laborers like to live on \$104 a year? But of course, according to the free trader, the agricultural laborers go into some more profitable employment. Let us see how they go, and where.

The "London Truth" says:—

A vast number of agricultural laborers found it difficult to get work, and so became coal-miners. In 1886, there were 619,106 miners; in 1892, there were 963,000. In order that this large number should find work, the working days of the week were reduced, with a consequent reduction of wages.

To this movement of labor from the field to the mines, the great coal strike of last summer was the terrible answer. This is what would happen here if our industrial wage-earners were forced out of their present position by increased foreign importations on to the lands or into the mines. It is not a pleasant picture to contemplate, and yet a great party in this country is actually struggling to

bring it about. But in England, while her newspapers are urging us to adopt free trade, and her manufacturers, like Mr. Fielden, are waiting breathlessly to rush into our markets, some Englishmen are once more recalling the words of one of England's great prime ministers, uttered to deaf ears in the hour of the free-trade triumph. On the third reading of the repeal bill in 1846, Mr. Disraeli said :—

It may be vain now, in the midnight of their intoxication, to tell them there will be an awakening to bitterness. It may be idle now, in the springtide of their economic frenzy, to warn them that there will be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive ; then, when their spirit is softened by misfortune, they will recur to those principles which made England great, and in our belief can alone keep England great. They may then perchance remember, not with unkindness, those who, betrayed and deserted, were neither ashamed nor afraid to struggle for the good old cause—the cause with which are associated principles the most popular, sentiments the most utterly national—the cause of labor, the cause of the people, the cause of England.

Nothing remains but the free-trade promise to increase trade. From official figures I will show the percentage of increase in English exports from decade to decade since 1830. I will also show the percentage of increase in American exports during the same period :—

Decade.	Increase of exports over preceding decade.	
	English.	American.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
1820-1830
1830-1840	25.0	58.0
1840-1850	38.1	20.3
1850-1860	88.8	95.2
1860-1870	59.3	8.7
1870-1880	36.5	129.0
1880-1890	5.5	39.7
Average increase.....	42.2	58.5
Average increase, excluding 1860-1870.	68.4

These tables, which exhibit accurately the volume of trade, require but little comment. It must be remembered in considering them that the principal argument of the free trader is that by his system we shall expand trade and increase the volume of exports, thereby widening the circulation of our products, and thus stimulate and enlarge production. A glance at these tables shows that the average rate of increase in British exports during six decades was 42.2 per cent, while for the same decades (five of which were under a high and one under a low tariff, but none under absolute free trade) the average rate of increase in the exports of the United States was 58.5 per cent. In these six decades I have included the war decade, from 1860 to 1870, which was of course wholly abnormal and ought not to be included in getting the true average increase. Excluding the war decade, the average increase of exports from the United States by decades since 1830 is 68.4 per cent against 42.2 per cent in free-trade England. In other words, on the most vital point made by the free trader we find that under protection the United States

has beaten England over 25 per cent in the rate of increase in exports. What becomes of the free trader's promises, that by his system we are to get larger markets and wider circulation for our products, when for sixty years we have increased our exports under protection so much more rapidly than free-trade England? If we can increase our exports more rapidly under protection than England can hers under free trade, how absurd it is to ask us to adopt free trade in order to enlarge our market. It will also be observed from these tables that the decline in English exports has been steady since the decade from 1850 to 1860, when all trade was so enormously stimulated by the gold discoveries of California and Australia, and that during the last decade all increase has practically ended.

I will now give a series of tables showing how England raises her revenue. I will not pause to comment upon them. Any one who will take the trouble to examine them can see how much more the English methods of raising revenue burden the poorer classes of the population than our methods do under our existing system: —

[Whittaker's Almanack, 1894.]

Public net revenue of Great Britain, 1893, and the sources from which it is derived.

Customs	\$98,575,000
Excise	126,800,000
Stamps (excluding fee, etc., stamps)	69,025,000
Land tax	5,200,000
House duty	7,050,000
Property and income tax	67,350,000
Post-office	52,000,000
Telegraph service	12,400,000
Crown lands (net)	2,150,000
Stamps in lieu of fees	44,162,840
Interest on advances	1,101,980

Interest on Suez shares	\$994,145
Miscellaneous	4,313,570
Allowance from the Bank of England	854,850
Local taxation	<u>36,071,010</u>

The total revenue of Great Britain for 1892-'93 . 488,048,395

The custom duties are collected as follows:—

Beer, etc.	\$66,955
Chicory	305,445
Cocoa, 50 cents per 100 pounds	534,455
Coffee, 4 cents per pound	867,135
Currants	501,340
Figs, plums, and prunes	271,350
Raisins	957,845
Spirits —	
Rum	10,390,310
Brandy	6,671,105
Gin	764,490
Other spirits	2,629,350
Tea, 8 cents per pound	17,031,125
Tobacco, 80 cents to \$1.25 per pound	50,622,175
Wine	6,351,240
All other	<u>15,840</u>
Total	97,980,160

A trifling change of duty was made when the chancellor introduced his budget for the year.

Another contributory item is that of woods, forests, and land revenues of the Crown; the produce for the year, including a balance of \$110,755 brought forward, was \$2,577,980; of this \$1,720,000 was paid into the exchequer, same as in the years preceding.

The miscellaneous contains the following items:—

Small branches of the hereditary revenue	\$130,880
Bank of England (profits of issue).	854,855
Naval prize fund.	1,000
Contributions from Indian revenues	90,135

Expenses of administration of local loans	\$207,655
Receipts by civil departments	4,064,310
Receipts by revenue departments	152,235
Post-office savings banks	255,590
Trustee savings banks	25,325
Savings on grants of Parliament, etc..	16,090
Isle of Man	50,000
Greek loan.	39,720
Conscience money	11,540
From Transvaal	75,470
Bankruptcy act, 1883	153,090
City of London parochial charities act, 1883	11,935
Casual receipts	6,085
Fees, etc., stamps	4,162,840
Total miscellaneous revenue	10,308,755

Stamps are bought at the Somerset House, and placed on all bills and deeds according to value.

House duty: On inhabited houses, occupied as farm houses, coffee shops, warehouses, and shops of the annual value of not less than \$100. From four cents to eighteen cents on each fifty cents of value, amounting to \$7,050,000.

The excise portion of inland revenue heads the list. The chief items of this are intoxicants. This item amounts to \$126,800,000, or more than one fourth of the entire revenue of the country.

The chief items contributing to the excise portion of the inland revenue, net, are for 1893, as follows:—

Spirits	\$76,420,335
Beer	47,229,465
Licenses	1,171,400
Railways	1,551,625
Total	126,372,823

STAMPS, 1893.

Stamps are next in order. They produce the very respectable sum of \$69,025,000, the largest portion of which comes from the deaths, probate, legacy, and succession duties.

Death duties —

Probate and account	\$23,980,295
Legacy	17,210,455
Succession	7,279,030
Estate duty, personalty	5,458,800
Estate duty, realty	814,510
Total	<u>54,743,090</u>

The above are some of the largest items under the head of stamps (excluding fee, etc., stamps). These amounts were actually received and form a part of the net annual revenue.

PROPERTY AND INCOME TAX.

All modern chancellors have found this elastic tax most useful.

The following gives the amount obtained from the several classes:—

A (lands, tenements, etc.)	\$20,591,230
B (occupation of lands, etc.)	1,104,340
C (annuities, dividends, etc.)	4,801,330
D (trades, professions, etc.)	36,114,890
E (public offices, etc.)	4,586,000
Total	<u>67,197,885</u>

STAMPS IN LIEU OF FEES.

Stamps under this heading are affixed to all bills, bills of lading, bills of exchange, checks, certificates of birth and marriage, etc., amounting to \$4,162,840.

GROSS REVENUE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE FOR 1893.

Net amount \$488,048,395

COST TO COLLECT.

Customs	4,252,970
Inland revenue	8,825,000
Post office	32,565,000
Telegraph	12,975,000
Packet service	3,605,405

Total gross revenue received by the British government from all sources 550,271,775

This is collected from the poor as well as the rich. The duty on tea is eight cents a pound, coffee four cents per pound; and there is no discrimination in the tax on tea or coffee as to quality. The rich and poor pay the same tax on the commodities.

The total number of paupers in England, Wales, Ireland, and the Kingdom of Scotland is 979,440. (Twenty-eight persons in every one thousand are paupers.) Population, 38,000,000.

One person in every twelve needs relief to keep him from starvation. In London two persons out of every nine die in the workhouse or other public institutions; in Manchester one out of every five.

The cost to maintain the paupers of Great Britain for the past year was \$46,273,915.

The "London Christian" says:—

One out of every two laboring men over sixty years of age comes under the law.

The number of paupers in the United States is 97,265 (one and one half persons in every one thousand). Population, 62,000,000.

Mr. John Morley, secretary for Ireland, in addressing the Amalgamated Society of Engineers at Newcastle in May, 1889, declared: "It is an awful fact — it is really not short of awful — that in this country, with all its wealth, its vast resources, and all its power, 45 per cent — that is to say, nearly one half of the persons who reach the age of sixty — are, or have been, paupers."

What, then, do we find in the experience of Great Britain or in the condition of her population under free trade to warrant our making the vast industrial change with which we are threatened? We not only do not get anything to show that the change must be obviously and surely beneficial, but, on the contrary, all the evidence points strongly the other way. We find that their natural conditions are wholly different from ours, that no other civilized nation has adopted the British system, and that even her own colonies have abandoned it. We find that England does not hesitate to apply protection where she thinks it profitable. She gives vast subsidies, which are protective bounties, to her shipping. She has just imposed import duties in India, but she has excepted cotton goods and yarns, nearly half the imports, thus giving a protective discrimination in those vast possessions in favor of the Lancashire mills, proving in this way that her eagerness to have other nations adopt free trade is simply that she may have markets which are now closed to her. We have found also that wages have been declining in England under free trade during a period of twenty years. By the tables of exports we learn that exports increase faster under American protection than under British free trade. We see from other statistics that she has twenty-eight paupers to every one thousand, against one and one half in the United States. We know that the

stream of emigration flows from England to the United States; we know, in one word, that wages are better here, the standard of living higher, and the opportunities of life larger than in England. All this we are asked to abandon in order to try the free-trade system, which the British colonies have thrown aside, and about the merit of which England herself is hesitating to-day. If we make such a change, Hamlet's reproach might well be made to us: "Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed, and batten on this moor?"

Such in outline have been the history and results of free trade in the only country which has adopted it. Let us see now what it promises and what rewards it offers when it asks for adoption in the United States. No one will deny that under protection, and especially during the last thirty years, this country has enjoyed a great prosperity, and that its progress and material development have been little short of marvelous. When we are asked to lay aside a system under which we have been so successful, the inducement ought to be very great and the reward very sure. In coming to a decision so momentous and a change so far reaching, we ought to understand well what we are to gain by it. Free trade, as its name implies, makes trade of the first importance as a condition of natural wealth and prosperity. It starts, therefore, with a misconception. Dr. Johnson, who was not an economist, but who had a great deal of robust common sense, said once to Boswell: —

Depend upon it, this rage of trade will destroy itself. You and I shall not see it, but the time will come when there will be an end of it. Trade is like gaming. If a whole company are gamblers the play must cease, for there is nothing to be won. When all nations are traders, there is nothing to be gained by

trade, and it will stop first where it is brought to the greatest perfection. Then the proprietors of land only will be great men.

No one would think of quoting Dr. Johnson as an authority on political economy, and his vigorous statements generally ran, as in this instance, to extremes. Yet none the less his strong sense of the relation of things has here grasped the fundamental truth that production is far more essential than trade. I do not in the least underrate the importance of trade; but as a source of wealth and national well-being it is secondary to production, and if we give it the first place in our consideration we begin with a serious error, and one capable of leading us far astray. The true and lasting source of wealth is production, while trade, even though it enhances the value of the product, is at the same time a tax upon production, on account of the cost of transportation. A nation without trade may be permanently rich and prosperous, but a nation without production and dependent solely on trade holds riches and prosperity by a frail tenure. This proposition is susceptible of historic proof. The Venetians were at one time the richest people in Europe. They "held the gorgeous East in fee," and all the trade between the east and west passed through the city of the lagoons. Their wealth came from the cost of transportation which was paid to them, and from the tolls and taxes which they imposed upon the vast quantities of merchandise which passed through their hands. They were sufficiently powerful to combat for years the power of the Turkish Empire, and they fought with Europe banded against them in the League of Cambray. They were not producers. They had no agriculture, and, except for the manufacture of glass, lace, and certain stuffs, they had no industries.

The route to the East by the Cape of Good Hope was discovered, and the Eastern trade passed into new channels. With the departure of her trade, Venice sank to rise no more. She had no industries, no production to fall back upon. She became a second-rate Italian city, with nothing left of the days of her glory but the manufacture of lace and glass, the pictures which her artists had painted, and the palaces and churches which her merchant princes had built. The Eastern trade passed to Portugal, and quickly passed away, leaving the country with only her native products for support. Holland built up her trade, threw off the yoke of Spain, and for a century was one of the first powers of Europe, and the rival of England in the narrow seas. Yet Holland, despite her splendid people, was not large enough in territory nor strong enough in numbers to hold out against larger countries and more numerous races. She ceased to dominate in trade, and when trade failed she sank to what she is to-day, one of the lesser powers of Europe. She was saved from the fate of Venice, not by the trade that remained, but by the fact that, although trade had been her principal source of wealth, she was also a producer and a colonizer of productive countries, and it is her industries and her agriculture — in one word, her production — which has maintained her even as she is at the present time.

These examples show that trade alone cannot assure to a people lasting prosperity, and if we look at it carefully we can see that there is no reason why it should be otherwise. Take trade in its last expression, and it is but the exchange of existing values or their representatives. Trade is very brisk at Monte Carlo, and large sums of money are made and lost there by the exchange of what

represents real values. Yet the prosperity of Monte Carlo is not desirable. Trade is most active in the Paris Bourse, the London Stock Exchange, and on Wall Street. In all those places that which represents real values passes rapidly from hand to hand, and vast fortunes are lost and won. In no place is barter, so beloved of the free trader, carried to such an ideal height; yet the stock exchanges of the world add nothing to the real wealth of the community. They are conveniences, but they create nothing. They deal in the symbols of wealth, but the wealth itself is made elsewhere, — on the farm and in the factory, in the mine and the workshop. Trade is really valuable only as a means of giving wider circulation to products. In this capacity it is of very great importance, but in no other, and the cost of transportation is a tax which production pays for this wider circulation. It is of the utmost importance that a nation should pay this tax to itself and not to others. We suffer from the fact that we pay the cost of transportation of our imports and exports largely to other nations, and we shall continue to do so until we give to our foreign commerce the same protection which other nations give to theirs, and which we have extended to our domestic industries and to our coastwise trade. We have protected the shipbuilder but not the shipowner, and an incomplete system cannot do otherwise than fail. We have refused protection to our commerce, the precise point where England has bestowed it with lavish hand. Now we are asked to give up the system under which our industries and coastwise trade have flourished, and replace it by that under which our foreign carrying trade has been ruined.

The wider circulation of products then is, as I have said, the only thing in trade which enhances their value,

and free trade promises us this by saying that if we adopt it we shall obtain the markets of the world. This is highly desirable, but we ought to know first just what we are going to get, and, second, what price we are going to pay, for it is quite possible to pay too high a price for anything, even the markets of the world, and we can get nothing under present earthly conditions without paying for it. When a free trader is asked what our immediate advantage is to be from the adoption of his policy, he glibly replies, "The markets of the world," and feels, after the manner of his school, that the whole matter is settled by a well-sounding phrase. Unfortunately we cannot stop there. We must go farther and have something more satisfying than a glittering generality, the favorite hiding-place of delusions. The "markets of the world" sounds delightfully, but what markets? At this point the free trader gives out; and yet it is the very essence of the whole question.

Let us run over briefly these markets of the world, and see just what they are. To Europe we now sell cotton and wheat and a few great staples. England takes what she must and no more, and the same is true of the Continent. No change of tariff policy would enlarge our European market for breadstuffs or food products. Our great and familiar exports, or staples, are in reality declining seriously, owing to the competition of India, Egypt, and the Slavonic countries in the markets of Europe, which in the past we have practically controlled. This situation cannot be affected by free trade or protection, because the markets from which we are being driven are not our own. Barter does not enter into it, for we do not take breadstuffs from any one. We are simply being pushed out of foreign markets for breadstuffs by

the competition of a labor so cheap that we cannot meet it.

Statistics show that we cannot even hold our foreign market for breadstuffs, much less enlarge it ; and it is also true that, with the exception of pork and other meat products, there is practically no market in Europe or in England, so far as we are concerned, for anything else. They are all industrial or manufacturing countries, with large surplus production, and all except Great Britain have protective tariffs. Australia is protected, and so is Canada. There remain, then, the countries of the East and of South America, valuable markets, I have no doubt, but of limited purchasing power, and, as Mr. Reed said in the House, "with three generations of Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans camped in possession of every avenue of trade." The markets of the world, therefore, come down to this, that under free trade we are to have an opportunity, according to the free trader a better opportunity than at present, of struggling with England, France, and Germany for entrance into the Eastern and South American markets ; that is, of competing for certain limited foreign markets against nations whose labor costs and standards of living are lower than our own. This does not seem a very magnificent opportunity, even as I have stated it ; and yet I have made no reference to the price which free trade proposes to make us pay for this privilege, although the price must be considered before the case is complete.

Under Republican rule we entered upon a policy intended to give us a share of the South American market. We proposed by reciprocity to get the South American countries and West India Islands to admit us to their markets on better terms than other nations, by offering

them in return the free admission to our markets of certain of their products which we were bound to import in any event from some country, because we did not produce them ourselves. In other words, we paid them for admission to their markets with a preference over our competitors by favorable admission to our own. The policy was sound in theory, and has begun to produce good results. Statistics show also that the decrease in our exports of breadstuffs is being replaced by an increase in the exports of manufactured articles of a higher value than the great staples, and that this is largely due to reciprocity.

The free trader on seeing these figures is always prompt to exclaim that a manufacturer who can export ought not to have any protection. They forget that such manufacturers have reached this exporting point because the home market was secure. If you throw down the barriers which protect them at home you force them to struggle for the home market as for the foreign market, weakening their hold on the former and thereby losing the latter. More important still than the general proposition is the fact, which by itself is conclusive, that this increase of the export of manufactures is chiefly to countries with which we have lately formed reciprocity treaties, impossible without a protective tariff, for without protection you will have nothing to give for the advantages you ask and receive.

As reciprocity of this sort cannot exist without protection, the Democratic party proposes to destroy it, as they do not seem to care for any extension of trade where the foreign country is obliged to make concessions to us. Under their scheme nothing is to be exacted from the foreigners, but we are to give everything. The price which we are

to pay is not a limited admission to our market, but our market itself. They promise us an opportunity to compete, not for the markets of the world, but for a limited number of foreign markets, with nations having lower labor costs than ours. In return they ask us to abandon reciprocity, which is increasing our exports of manufactured products, and to throw our own market open to those same nations as well as to all others. The price is certain and enormous, while the vague promise, even if fulfilled, is as nothing to it; and when we add to all this the fact just shown, that our exports have increased faster than those of England, it seems incredible that any one can be found even to attempt to argue that we shall enlarge our market by free trade. We not only sacrifice our home market, but sacrifice it for a system which increases exports less than protection.

And what a vast sacrifice the home market would be! Our own market is the best in the world, because we are the richest people, with the largest purchasing power. If the statistics of Mulhall are correct, our seventy million people equal in consumption seven hundred million, or half the population of the world outside our boundaries. This great home market is now our own. The free trader proposes to abandon it, and throw it open to other nations from whom he asks nothing in return, and merely promises that we shall have a chance to compete on equal terms for the markets which we are already getting under reciprocity in the West Indies and in South America. As a business proposition no madder scheme was ever proposed, and no more insane policy was ever urged upon an intelligent people. We are gravely asked to give up the American market, the most valuable material possession on the face of the earth, and we are not even offered a definite price.

We are promised nothing but the vague result of a doubtful theory, and, if English experience may be trusted, a consequent diminution of exports. This is literally all that free trade offers to the people of the United States in the direction of a wider circulation for our products. They have, however, on the domestic side another promise. They tell us that if we throw our market open to the world we shall be able to buy cheaper, or, in other words, that our purchasing power will be increased. This assumes that rates of wages will remain unchanged, for you cannot enlarge a purchasing power by cheapening the thing purchased if you diminish the original purchasing power from other causes in an equal or greater ratio. To put it a little more plainly, if a man earns two dollars a day, and by cheapening what he buys you enable him to get for a dollar what now costs him a dollar and a half, you have increased his purchasing power ; but if, while you cheapen the article purchased, you lower his wages from two dollars to one dollar a day, the net result is a diminution of his purchasing power, and consequent privation. It is too often forgotten that two things go to make up purchasing power. One is the amount earned ; the other is the cost of the thing purchased. The first is the more important, and is generally neglected by the free traders. Yet purchasing power really rests on the power to earn — that is, upon production. If we do not produce, we do not earn ; and if we do not earn, it is of very little consequence whether the things we desire to purchase are cheap or dear.

The proposition of the free trader that by the removal of duties we shall be enabled to buy cheaper involves of necessity increased importations, and a corresponding decrease in either the amount or the prices of the home

product. If we increase importations, just so far do we replace American products with those of foreigners, and just so far we proportionately narrow the opportunities for American labor. Here, of course, the free trader is ready with an answer. "You forget," he says, "the great principle of barter. If we buy foreign goods, where we formerly bought American goods, we pay for them with other products, and so, of course, the sum of production remains the same." Having thus completed his phrase he stops, just as he does with 'the markets of the world.' But we cannot stop there. We must look farther. What are the American products with which we shall pay for these increased importations from Europe? Obviously not the great staples, for we now sell all that Europe can take. Obviously, again, not manufactured goods, for Europe has a large surplus production of those already. Nothing practically remains, then, but money; that is, our coin reserves and the product of our mines, to pay for these increased importations. In other words, we should enter upon a process of stripping ourselves of our gold and silver, in order to pay for these increased importations which have replaced American goods. But let us go still further into this matter. By replacing American products with foreign products we throw the labor nominally employed in making those American products out of employment. That labor must go somewhere. The free trader says that it will find its way into those employments where we have a natural superiority, and where it is most profitable. As usual, he stops short on a half truth, for this is not all. This labor, by going into fields already occupied, increases the supply of labor in those fields and reduces wages. The more you concentrate labor in a few fields of employment, and the more you

narrow its opportunities and diminish the diversification of industry, the smaller will be the demand for labor and the greater will be the reduction of wages. But there is still another side to this. Instead of narrowing the opportunities of labor, we can prevent increased importations by making them unprofitable. Unfortunately the only way we can make them unprofitable is by making our own costs lower than those of the foreigners, and there is no way to lower costs except by lowering wages. Thus we come back at every turn of the free-trade policy to a reduction of wages, and every free trader who knows anything of his subject, and is not talking for political effect, will admit this to be true.

Sometimes he forgets himself, and in a moment of frankness not only admits that free trade will reduce wages, but defends the reduction. Such was the case with the Hon. John C. Black, of Illinois, on the 9th of January last, during the tariff debate in the House. I quote from the "Record": —

MR. CANNON of Illinois. My colleague refers to a half million of immigrants coming to this country each year, the most of whom are attracted by the larger wages here. Do I understand my friend that the remedy which he would propose to prevent that immigration would be by decreasing the wages of the American workingman by bringing him into competition, not with the half million who come to our borders annually from abroad, but with the labor of the two hundred millions on the other side, who would send their products here free, in competition with our labor?

MR. BLACK of Illinois. Well, the question is ponderous, but fair, and I will try to reply to it. If I was being chased by bees, I would throw the honey down. If I was being set upon by wolves, I would get the fresh meat out of their sight.

MR. REED. Even if the children also did not get it?

MR. BLACK of Illinois. If I was certain that the American workingman of to-day was being overwhelmed by a vast mass of men seeking these shores because they believed that wages were higher, — a belief which is false in the long run, — and if I believed that that delusion depended upon a system of misleading laws, I should seek to repeal those laws, to let wages have their natural place all around the world, and let people move all around the world in their own way. I would not toll them over here by a system of laws, the effect of which is to drive American workingmen from their places, and to delude into starvation those who are thus attracted here.

MR. REED. Then the gentleman favors an equality of wages between this country and others from which we have immigration?

MR. BLACK of Illinois. That is not a fair way to put the question.

MR. REED. You can make it fair in answering.

MR. BLACK of Illinois. I make answer by the removal of the artificial means by which we create a fictitious value of the article of wages, and let wages have its natural level, as it does elsewhere.

Here is a complete confession which no subsequent explanation could disguise, and the simile used to defend it is quite perfect. We have honey, and are to throw it down because the bees pursue us. We have meat, and are to get rid of wolves by throwing it away. Why not keep the honey and drive off the bees? Why not keep the meat and shoot the wolves? Yet this typical free trader asks us to give up a good thing because other people want it, and advises our lowering wages because other people come here in search of them. No more complete picture of what free trade means and to what it leads could possibly be devised. Sometimes the free trader

will say more adroitly, but less truthfully, that the reduction of wages will be met by the cheapening of articles to be purchased, but statistics show that this is false. In the comparisons made by Colonel Wright between the Massachusetts industries and those of England, it was proved that after every allowance made for greater cheapness of commodities and of the necessities of life, the Massachusetts workingman had a net advantage of between 45 and 50 per cent over his British competitor. Therefore, under free trade we must have an actual net reduction in our wages, whether we force our labor into other channels of employment or whether we compete with foreign industries. This means a lowering of the standard of living, which will be little short of a revolution. We pay for everything in this world, and this reduction of wages and diminution of earning power is the heavy price we must pay for the greater cheapness promised by the free trader.

There is in this connection another most important point to be considered. Whether under free trade goods would be cheaper and the purchasing power of a dollar increased, it is certain that the price of labor would be greatly reduced. Now the labor cost is the chief and, indeed, nearly the whole cost in everything we have. All our railroads and factories have been built, our farms cleared, our mines developed, at a certain labor cost. Reduce suddenly the value of labor by free trade, and the whole of our vast industrial and transportation plant will be reduced in value. It must come down to the level of the new and lower labor costs at which future competitors could be constructed. This would mean a revolution in the value of all the machinery of industry and transportation, and would involve a vast liquidation and gigantic losses, com-

ing as this change would come with such a sudden shock. The loss to business and capital of such a rapid change would be incalculable, and the further loss to labor which this destruction to capital would cause would be more incalculable still. The wealth of a country is in production, and the strength of a country is in its producers. It is worse than idle to talk about consumers, as if they were a vast proportion and a distinct part of the population, who ought alone to be considered. The mere consumers constitute not only an insignificant but a wholly unimportant fraction of the community. Everybody is a consumer and at the same time a producer, or dependent upon production for his support. The first object of our policy, therefore, should be to do what is best for the producer, because production means both wealth and wages, and consumption depends upon the capacity for production. If, in a search for other markets, we give up our own, we lose more than we gain, and, instead of widening, we narrow the circulation of our products, and thereby diminish their value and limit production.

Our first object should be to hold our own market, because it is the largest and best; and that being done and our own market securely guarded, our next object should be to increase our outside markets by any possible device. By means of invention and protection we have been enabled thus far to maintain high rates of wages in the United States, while lowering the price of the necessities and comforts of life and raising the standard of living. If we abandon protection, we shall probably in many directions increase prices by withdrawing American competition from the competition of the world, and thereby raising the world's price. In any event, we shall lower wages. Protection does not make high wages, but it helps

to prevent their reduction. We have high wages in the United States, and our labor costs are consequently high. So far as natural resources go, we are more richly endowed by nature than any country in the world. It is only when we take from the earth its manifold gifts and touch them with the hands of labor that they become higher priced than elsewhere. The entire difference between our prices and those of Europe, when such difference exists, really lies in the labor costs. From the man who digs the clay, quarries the stone, or mines the iron, from which the factory is built, to the operative who guides the most complicated machinery in the completed buildings, the labor cost is greater than in Europe, and the labor cost practically constitutes the whole cost, so far as any question of competition is concerned. With a duty equal to the difference in labor costs, our rates of wages can be maintained against outside competition. With the removal of such duties we must bring our labor costs down to theirs, or we must cease to manufacture and compete. To maintain these rates of wages is the whole purpose of protection, after we have got beyond the stage of establishing our industrial independence.

To maintain high rates of wages and to give, if possible, the fullest scope for their increase, I believe to be essential, because I believe good wages absolutely vital to the stability of our institutions and of our society. Protection and free trade present a social far more than an economic question, for on high wages and high standards of living depends the stability of society, and especially in a republic where every man has a vote, and where no privileged classes exist. Protection in its widest aspect is something far more than a mere question of schedules or of national bookkeeping. It is an effort to defend by

legislation our standards of living, just as the exclusion of the Chinese and of contract labor was. Protection is one feature of a great policy of self-preservation, which I believe to be essential to the future of this republic. To abandon it is to enter on changes which will go to the very bottom of our social and political fabric. Look at this country since the threat of free trade has hung closely over it. Look at the miseries and losses and wage reductions of the past year. If this is the result of the menace, what will the reality be? The reductions of wages thus far made are trifling to what will come if this bill becomes law, and men seek to adjust themselves to the new conditions. Such a lowering of wages is not to be contemplated without the deepest alarm. The country is agitated and frightened as at no previous time. "There is darkness before and danger's voice behind." While we debate rates of duties, the threat of this bill is really breaking down an important part of a broad general policy of society and government on which we must rely unless we are prepared to meet the shock of changes, which it would be difficult to portray. I have no fear of the ultimate result. I believe that the mighty forces which have brought the great races of man to their present position will not cease to operate. I feel sure that in the end we shall not cast aside the policies which are to protect us from the lowering and deadly competition of races with lower standards of living than our own.

But however confident I may feel of the ultimate result, I do not wish to see my country go through the wretchedness which even a temporary abandonment of these policies will cause. It is too great a risk to take, too high a price to pay. Any great industrial change, no matter how fair its promises, is a grave peril, and sure to entail

grievous losses. Let me quote on this point one of the first of American political economists, General Francis A. Walker, who is not a protectionist. In a recent pamphlet on the subject of bimetallism, General Walker says: —

These are the economists who say that what one loses another will gain. They are the same economists who used to assert that it would not matter if wages were at any time unduly depressed by combinations of employers, inasmuch as the excess of profits resulting would infallibly become capital, and as such constitute an additional demand for labor; and so the wrong would tend to right itself.

It has been the teaching of the economists of this sort which has so deeply discredited political economy with the laboring men on the one hand, and with practical business men on the other. The political economy of to-day recognizes the industrial structure as of the highest importance; it teaches that industrial injuries remain, deepen, and tend to become permanent; that sudden and violent changes are always to the prejudice of the least fortunate members of society, — the poor, the ignorant, and the inert, those who have little capital, those who are distant from the market, those who are at a disadvantage in the economic struggle, from whatever cause. It is with industrial society as it is with the human body. A certain portion of its substance is always in a fluid state, circulating unceasingly through the system, nourishing as it goes every part, every organ, every limb; but by far the largest part has taken on a permanent and unchangeable form, which cannot be crushed or mutilated or punctured without serious, perhaps fatal, injury.

The political economy which treats industrial society as in a state of flux, which regards undeserved losses as amply compensated by unearned gains of an equal amount, which declares that, whatever happens in the field of industry, readjustment will promptly and surely take place, is exactly on a par with the physiology which should assume that a tall, lank man could,

by the pressure of a certain number of "atmospheres," be made over at will into a short, stout man of the same weight, without loss of life or energy.

The Democratic party has undertaken to make a revolutionary change in our industrial system, and the effects pointed out by General Walker have followed hard upon the threat. Yet the Democrats have lost heart as they have proceeded. One concession has followed another, until it would be a mockery to call this bill the expression of any economic doctrine, still more so to represent it as carrying out the principles declared by the Democratic party at Chicago. A broad and equal policy of free trade might be defended on theoretical grounds. It would at least have meaning, and could be understood. But a bill which wrecks a protective policy, only to put in its place a set of schedules which slaughter some industries and give premiums to others, is wholly indefensible. To replace a protective system with free trade is at least intelligible, but to destroy by threats of industrial revolution such a prosperity as we enjoyed under the protective system in 1892 is as wanton as it is ignorant and cruel. If we are to have protection, let us have it for every interest, equal and fair to all. If we are to have free trade, let us have the real thing, and have it for everybody, for that at least will be fair. But an ignorant mixture of these two systems is in practice as impossible as it is unjust.

I reserve what I have to say on the details of this measure for some future occasion. I do not propose to spend any time now in discussing the bill before us. As I have said, it embodies no policy and has no system. It is not protection; it is not free trade. It is a mere collection of preferences and revenges. It is filled with injustice and

inequality. It shuts the door upon any hope of union with Canada, for it gives to Canada every advantage of union without exacting any return, and frees her from all inducements to become, as she ought to become, part of the United States. It is a reactionary movement to an outworn system, resting on a general doctrine which finds no defense in practice anywhere. It has no element of stability, and its enactment promises nothing but continued change and agitation. The stock jobbing and speculation of Wall Street have been with it from its cradle, and soon, I trust, may weep beside its grave. The great trusts are guarded by its provisions; but there is no line to show that the farmer, the workingman, or the manufacturer have been heard or regarded in its schedules.

I turn from this printed deformity to the broad principle which the party to whom we owe this bill pretended to advocate, and which I have already discussed. That is the principle of let-alone in the government, the refusal to use the power of the state to benefit the community. Protection rests on the broad doctrine that the power of the community can be wisely used in certain cases for the benefit of the whole body politic. There is no magic in it. We leave to the free trader the privilege of claiming that he has a panacea for all human ills in a patent tariff policy. We uphold a system of tariff protection because we believe it is one important method of defending the standards of living in the United States from a fatal and degrading competition. We believe in maintaining, defending, and uplifting the standards of living of the American people, because upon those standards rest our civilization and the onward march of our race. Men have struggled up from the darkness which shrouds their beginnings by slow and strenuous endeavor. They have fought their way

to the light through many defeats and with much sore labor. They have not done it by any doctrine of *laissez faire* or "let-alone," but by united and unrelenting effort. The same force which has created great nations has created civilization, and great nations are the denial of the let-alone theory. "*Laissez faire*, Supply-and-Demand, one begins to be weary of all that. Leave all to egoism, to ravenous greed of money, of pleasure, of applause. It is the Gospel of Despair."

OUR DUTY TOWARD HAWAII.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, JANUARY 19 AND 22, 1895.

OUR DUTY TOWARD HAWAII.

A motion having been made in the Senate to displace a pending measure, and consider a resolution by Mr. Frye that the Executive Government send a warship to Honolulu —

MR. LODGE said: —

MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to say something in regard to my reasons for thinking that the pending motion should prevail, in order that we may take up the subject of Hawaii, which appears to me a little more immediate and pressing this morning than even the immediate infliction of the income tax upon an innocent people.

THE PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts will allow the Chair to state that the conference report has already been concurred in. The pending question was on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Cockrell], that the Senate recede from two of its amendments, pending which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Chandler] moved to postpone the further consideration of the conference report until Monday next at two o'clock.

MR. LODGE. So I understand, Mr. President. I meant merely that the points relate to the conference report.

Mr. President, we have heard this morning through the press dispatches that there has been an uprising in Hawaii, accompanied with considerable fighting and

bloodshed and the loss of some valuable lives. It will be remembered that when, in response to my inquiry, the report of Admiral Walker was laid before the Senate, the admiral, in his letters addressed to the Department, stated that the objection to withdrawing the American war-ships was that it would leave the impression on the native mind that this country sympathized with a royalist uprising.

In some remarks which I had the honor to submit to the Senate, I called attention to that point in urging the adoption of a resolution of inquiry in regard to the fact that we had no war-ships there. I pointed out that it made no difference whether the natives were right or wrong in their opinion that such withdrawal implied the sympathy of the United States for the ex-Queen. Such, in any event, was the effect which the withdrawal of our man-of-war produced upon their minds. It was a direct encouragement to an uprising of this character. Admiral Walker also stated, it will be remembered, that he had no doubt of the capacity of the existing government to maintain itself. That capacity has been shown by the events about which we read in this morning's newspapers.

Admiral Walker went further. He also called attention to his belief that the withdrawal of our ship while the British ships still remained, would be considered an evidence of the sympathy of Great Britain for the royalist party, and he believed, from what he had been able to learn, that British sympathy ran in that direction. He also called attention to the Japanese interests there, and the threatening character of the Japanese population. These views and opinions were made light of and disregarded at the time by the administration, but they are more than justified by recent events.

After the publication of the Walker Report a message

was sent to Congress by the President of the United States, in which he urged us so to modify our treaty with Hawaii that Great Britain may obtain the use of an island in order to land a British cable. In that message the President took occasion to say, with what I think was a covert reflection upon Admiral Walker, his own witness, but one who had proved unsatisfactory in that capacity to the President's policy, that —

Some of the dispatches from our minister, which are submitted, not only refer to the project for leasing an uninhabited island belonging to Hawaii, but contain interesting information concerning recent occurrences in that country, and its political and social condition. This information is valuable, because it is based upon the observation and knowledge necessarily within the scope of the diplomatic duties which are intrusted solely to the charge of this intelligent diplomatic officer representing the United States Government at Hawaii.

The “intelligent diplomatic officer representing the United States Government at Hawaii” was prompt to disavow, in the dispatch referred to, what Admiral Walker had said, and to intimate that the admiral's belief that there was any undue British influence in those islands was wholly unfounded. He also dwelt upon the peaceful condition of the islands, and generally contradicted the views which Admiral Walker had submitted to the Secretary of the Navy. I read from the general press dispatches of this morning the following statement as a commentary on the views of the “intelligent diplomatic officer”: —

The arrangements were for a general uprising in several parts of Honolulu and the seizure of the palace. The royalists had been assured by the British consul-general that if they held

the palace three hours he would recognize them as the government.

The same dispatches give us to understand that the arms and ammunition of the insurgents came from Vancouver, and that Canadians were among the leaders of the rioters.

There is never any particular pleasure in saying, "I told you so," when the event is such an unfortunate one as this, and involves so much rioting and bloodshed as does the recent event at Hawaii; but I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that Admiral Walker's opinion and the opinions which I expressed, based on his report, have been absolutely justified. The withdrawal of our ships, it is clear, left the impression on the native mind that this country, in an underhand manner, if not openly, was endeavoring to give countenance to the royalists, or at least was ready to leave their path clear.

MR. PLATT. That is what the royalist commissioners came here to find out.

MR. LODGE. That, in my judgment, is precisely what the royal commissioners were seeking when they were here last summer. The events that we read about this morning have also shown, if the press dispatches can be relied upon at all, that the British officials there stood ready to take immediate advantage of the situation. I do not mean to imply that Great Britain is preparing to seize the Sandwich Islands and run up the British flag. Its treaty with France would prevent that; the attitude of this country would prevent it; but I do think it is perfectly clear that Great Britain is seeking, with the wise aggressiveness which characterizes her foreign policy, to establish British commercial supremacy in those islands. For that purpose Great Britain wishes to have an island upon

which to land a cable ; for that purpose it wishes to have the royalist government reëstablished, because it is a government favorable to British interests and unfavorable to ours. Every prediction that Admiral Walker's dispatches made, both as to the natives and as to British influence, is fully justified by the news we received this morning.

The proposition to put an English cable into those islands, and to open in that manner a pathway for British advance into islands which have always been identified with us, and where we have a considerable commerce and great interests, are all the outgrowth of the same mistaken policy in regard to the Sandwich Islands, while the rioting and bloodshed which have occurred there, deplorable as they are, although the result shows the strength of the existing government, are due to the same policy which took away our war-ships from Honolulu. That policy is not the policy of the American people. The policy of our State Department stands right athwart the wishes of the American people in regard to what we should do about Hawaii.

The desire of the American people, without distinction of party, is that we should at least control in those islands ; that our institutions should be predominant ; that the men of American blood who are administering the government should be sustained, and also, I believe, that the islands should become a part of the American Republic. The first effort of this administration was to maintain the royalist government. Even a Democratic Congress could not sustain that policy. The attempt failed, as the President stated in his letter to the royal commissioners last summer. The next step of the administration was to withdraw the war-ships, when it was well known that there

were royalist conspiracies there ; when it was well known that there was British sympathy there, and that the withdrawal of the war-ships would leave the islands exposed to just such an attempt as has been made.

It seems to me, in view of the news we have received, that the Senate should delay no longer in expressing its honest conviction on the subject. Two resolutions have been offered here this morning, one by the Senator from Maine [Mr. Frye], and one by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Kyle], both looking in the same direction — an expression of sympathy with the government and of approval of the course of the Hawaiian Government, — also urging that we should have proper representation there by the presence of a ship of war.

Both resolutions have been laid over by objections from distinguished Senators of the Democratic party ; and when I attempted to bring up the resolution which is lying upon the table, subject to the call of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Aldrich], we were met with this privileged conference report. I do not doubt the importance of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. We all realize the popular liking for the tax, for the execution of which that bill carries an appropriation. But I think this tax can afford to wait until the American Senate has expressed its views on the events which we read about this morning in the newspapers, until we have said to the Hawaiian Government that we sympathize with them, that we congratulate them on the strength and success they have shown, and that the American people at least, through their representatives in Congress, are not in favor of the un-American policy which has been pursued in those islands, first openly by the attempt to restore the government to the Queen, and then by the withdrawal of all

American ships, indicating to the people of those islands, as they supposed, that we had lost all interest in them, that we took away our ships in order to leave an open path for a royalist uprising and for the riot and bloodshed and the loss of valuable life, of which every one must read this morning with pain.

Saturday, January 22, 1895.

MR. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Gray] was kind enough in his remarks yesterday to give a good deal of attention to the observations which I made in the Senate on Saturday last, and of course I cannot but feel gratified that he should have done so. It shows that what I said was not wholly ineffective. My speech was open, like every public utterance, to criticism and debate; but I think when the Senator from Delaware undertakes to explain my motives, he falls into some confusion.

My motive in what I said was not, as he charged yesterday, to condemn the administration. The administration stands condemned now on this Hawaiian matter by the general opinion of the American people, and there is no need to add to that condemnation. I think the load is sufficiently heavy already. Still less do I desire to make any political capital out of this matter. There is no occasion for that; and the attitude of Democratic Senators in this debate is adding largely to the political capital already accumulated against their party, without any need of effort in that direction on my part. My only motive in moving these resolutions and urging action is that I feel very strongly that a great mistake has been made in our dealings with the Sandwich Islands, and that matters

there have been and are now in such a condition that the United States ought to take a positive position in the relations which it occupies toward them. I think the time has come to take some affirmative action. The present state of affairs seems to me in the highest degree discreditable to the Government of the United States.

The Senator from Delaware also criticised me for what I had said in regard to British influence, and he used the not very original phrase, that I was "twisting the lion's tail." I do not propose, Mr. President, to be deterred by that old cry from saying what seems to me to be true about British influence, if it is necessary to consider that subject at all. The views and the opinions, the desires or the hopes, of Great Britain, like those of every other foreign country, are a matter of profound indifference to me, except when they come in conflict with the interests of the United States. But when they do come in conflict with the interests of the United States, I propose, so far as in me lies, to uphold the American interests, as I see them, against the British interests, or those of any other foreign power. If that is "twisting the lion's tail," it may be called so by any one, and it is of no consequence to me whether the Senator uses the phrase or not. Phrases and catchwords are not arguments.

The Senator from Delaware undertook to state yesterday and to-day what the views and wishes of England were on this subject. Let me say frankly that I have no special means of knowing what the views or purposes of Great Britain may be in regard to the Sandwich Islands. I have no doubt, however, that the State Department is fully informed as to British views and what Great Britain wants. It certainly appears to be. My opinions are based solely on facts of general public notoriety and the course

of events. From these facts and events my conclusions are drawn. I think, in the first place, it is very obvious that British sympathy has always been and is now strongly with the royalist government, which has been righteously destroyed; that England would like its restoration, and is endeavoring to establish her commercial supremacy in those islands; and that her influence and efforts are hostile to the interests of the United States. I do not think it is necessary to imply that Great Britain proposes to seize the Sandwich Islands. There is a treaty with France which I suppose would prevent that. I do not think she would wish to take such an extreme measure under existing conditions. But I desire to call the attention of the Senate to what Great Britain has been doing in the Pacific Ocean during the last six years, which I think indicates that she is not averse to taking islands in that region.

In 1888 Great Britain took the Gilbert group of thirteen islands, 1500 miles from Hawaii; the Ellice group of five islands, 1800 miles from Hawaii; the Enderbury group of five islands, 1600 miles from Hawaii; the Union group of three islands, 1800 miles from Hawaii; and likewise Kingman, Fanning, Washington, Palmyra, Christmas, and Jarvis islands. She also took, still in the same year, Malden, Starbuck, Dudosa, Penrhyn, Vostok, Flint, and Caroline islands. Those islands were all taken in 1888, some of them within 1200 miles and some of them within 1800 miles of Hawaii. In 1889 she took Ruie Island, 2400 miles from Hawaii; Suwaroff Island, 1900 miles from Hawaii; and the Coral Islands, 900 miles from Hawaii. In 1891 she took Johnston Island, 600 miles from Hawaii; in 1892, Gardner Island, 1600 miles from Hawaii; and in the same year Danger Island, 1800 miles

from Hawaii. The islands of Palmyra and Johnston had been in possession of the Hawaiian Government since 1854, and are still claimed as a part of Hawaiian territory.

This record, including the seizure of two islands claimed by Hawaii, a very weak power, seems to indicate that England has been taking every Pacific island she could reach, and that she might be persuaded to take the Sandwich Islands if they came in her way. Great Britain, moreover, always coming nearer to Hawaii, attempted quite recently to add Necker Island to this long list of acquisitions. Necker Island is 460 miles, I believe, from Hawaii; and Great Britain was prevented from seizing it only by the quickness of the Hawaiian Government in establishing its authority over it. Great Britain is even now trying to procure it by obtaining a modification of our treaty, which will permit her to take Hawaiian territory.

MR. GRAY. If the Senator will allow me, does he not recognize the fact that, so far as Necker Island is concerned, the request to the Government of the United States comes from the Hawaiian Government that we shall consent to the lease of Necker Island for the purpose of landing a cable there?

MR. LODGE. They do not ask it. The President says they do, which is very different. They say they would like to submit to us the question of the desirability of modifying the treaty.

MR. GRAY. Mr. Willis says they did.

MR. LODGE. I quote Mr. Hatch's dispatch, which is in the papers I have here.

MR. GRAY. Mr. Willis says so.

MR. LODGE. Mr. Hatch is the minister of foreign

affairs of Hawaii. He speaks with authority superior even to Mr. Willis, and I suppose made the official statement of the Hawaiian Government.

It is perfectly obvious, Mr. President, that England, in pursuance of a well-settled policy, which I think is perfectly correct, for I have no sympathy with either the "Little England" party or its wretched equivalent in our politics, is taking possession of every island upon which she can conveniently lay her hands. It is a part of the conquering and aggressive policy of England. I am the last to find fault with her. I believe she is wise in doing so. My criticism is that we do not exhibit the same spirit, the true spirit of our race, in protecting American interests and advancing them everywhere and at all times. I do not mean that we should enter on a widely extended system of colonization. That is not our line. But I do mean that we should take all outlying territory necessary to our own defense, to the protection of the Isthmian Canal, to the upbuilding of our trade and commerce, and to the maintenance of our military safety everywhere. I would take and hold the outworks, as we now hold the citadel, of American power.

Such, then, have been the movements of England as to the taking of islands. But she has not stopped there. Within two years she has subsidized a steam line from Vancouver to Honolulu and Australia, and is trying now to get a cable established there, as every one knows. I have here extracts from the conference held at Ottawa of delegates from New Zealand and the Australian colonies, Canada and Great Britain, showing that their purpose is to get a cable passing entirely by the British Islands and "free from foreign control."

So much, Mr. President, for the general policy of Great

Britain in those waters. Now, as to her attitude as indicating that she has sympathy with the royalist government in the island of Hawaii. It is perfectly well known that Major Wodehouse, who was for many years her minister, was very strongly in favor of the royalist government. Her diplomatic representatives and her naval officers have been opposed openly to the republic, and favorable to the restoration of the Queen. It is also a matter of public notoriety that the Princess Kaiulani, who, upon the restoration of the monarchy, would be the heir to the throne, is the daughter of an Englishman, has lived for years and been educated in England, and is under the guardianship and special championship of Theophilus Davies, who came with her to this country and was with her here in Washington, and who seems to be very much concerned in the present revolution. The English bishop, the head of the English established church in Honolulu, still continues to have public prayers for the deposed Queen of the Islands, and in a religious monthly which he issues denounces the republic, characterizes President Dole as a usurper, and urges the restoration of the monarchy. When the Philadelphia was removed from Honolulu, the British man-of-war Hyacinth, to which reference was made yesterday, was retained there until December. I was not able until to-day to find out just how late the ship was retained, but I have now learned that it was until December. I have also made inquiries in regard to our practice of keeping ships there, to which the Senator from Delaware has referred to-day. It has not been the rule for a British man-of-war to be kept at Honolulu; but for the past thirty years there have been but three brief intervals, I find, during which there has been no American man-of-war in Hawaiian waters. Since 1886 there has been

hardly a day when there has not been from one to three American men-of-war in Hawaiian waters, until the withdrawal of the Philadelphia in September last. The ship that brought the arms to the Hawaiian revolutionists was bought by an Englishman, and the arms were shipped from an English port, from Canada; they were transshipped and landed by an Englishman, and the leaders of the insurrectionary parties were very largely Canadians. When the Alameda left Honolulu there were fifteen Englishmen under arrest for alleged complicity in the insurrection, and the British diplomatic representative had made demand upon the republic to be assured that capital punishment should not be inflicted upon any of the leaders of the revolution, a somewhat unusual proceeding. The arms then came from Vancouver. The leaders of the party were, many of them, Englishmen; and we were told in the press dispatches — how correctly I do not know — that the insurrectionists had received assurances from the British consul-general that they would be recognized if they could hold the palace for three hours.

Those are the facts, open and patent to all the world. To me they seem entirely to establish the case that British sympathy is with the royalist government; because England can more readily control it, because it is a government in her interest and not in ours, and because they would like to establish British commercial supremacy in those islands. I have not a word to say against their policy. They are acting in their own interest, and their whole course in the Pacific shows that, for commercial and military reasons, they are grasping every island they can get. It is asking a good deal of human credulity to believe that they are anxious to see us take the Sandwich Islands, or that they would not like to control them them-

selves. I am hostile to their interests and purposes because I believe they conflict with our own.

Then there is the question of the Japanese, in regard to which the Senator from Delaware seemed disposed to sneer when he asked if we were afraid of the Japanese. Not at all; we are afraid of no one. But any one who is familiar with the condition of affairs in Hawaii knows that there are over twenty thousand Japanese in those islands, that they are an element in the population disposed to be turbulent and to make trouble, and that they are regarded as very dangerous by all the people of the white race, English and Americans alike. They were left there in this threatening condition with no man-of-war of the United States present, and with a man-of-war belonging to Japan. I have no idea that Japan desires to get into trouble with the United States, or to attack American property or American citizens. So long as there is a man-of-war of the United States in the harbor, there is no danger of anything of that sort happening. Withdraw that man-of-war, and it is very easy to suppose an uprising of the Japanese; and if there should be an uprising and massacre, it would be very little comfort to be told afterwards that there was no good reason to expect it and that we were not afraid of Japan. It is to prevent just such troubles as this that I desire to see the United States properly represented in that harbor.

Mr. President, what has been the course of events in regard to our relations with those islands? When the present administration came into power, there was a treaty of annexation pending in the Senate. The President withdrew that treaty. Then an attempt was made to restore the Queen. For that we have the authority of the President. He stated it himself. He said, "My

plans have failed," referring in that letter to the plans to restore the Queen — the old government. That attempt having broken down, the matter was taken up in Congress, and a resolution passed here warning other nations of our interests in the island. After considerable delay, which excited a good deal of criticism, the present government was finally recognized by the administration. They placed a ship at Honolulu. This administration then sent Admiral Walker there themselves, put him in command, and directed him to report upon the situation. Up to the 20th of July they meant to keep a ship there, for in the dispatch of the Secretary of the Navy of that date he says that the *Charleston* was to go to Honolulu. After that date nothing more was said about it. In the meantime the persons who are called royal commissioners, and so referred to by the President, came to Washington. They were not royal commissioners; they were nothing but citizens of the Hawaiian Republic in the eye of the law; and the Queen whom they purported to represent was Mrs. Dominis, also a citizen of Hawaii. They had absolutely no authority; they came here without a vestige of official rank of any kind, and were conspirators against the existing government which we had recognized. It is a well-settled practice in international law that the only road for such persons to the President or Secretary of State is through the official representatives of the recognized Hawaiian Government.

That government had a legation here. But these persons did not approach the administration through that legation. They went directly to the Secretary of State. The President did not see them, because he was ill, but he addressed a letter to them. They were here from the 30th of July until the 15th of August. That was subse-

quent to the Secretary of the Navy's dispatch of the 20th, about which time they landed at San Francisco. On the 20th of July we know that it was the intention of the administration to keep a ship at Honolulu. After the 20th of July the idea was lost sight of. What the cause of that change may be, I do not pretend to say. I cannot imagine for what reason it was right and proper to keep a ship at Hawaii up to the 20th of July, and why it then became all wrong to keep one there. The only event that intervened, so far as we know, in our relations with those countries, was the arrival of these men who are called, or who call themselves, royal commissioners.

MR. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me to suggest to him a happening there which explains it, it seems to me, and gives a reason for the presence of that ship, and that was the election which was to be held there upon the new constitution and the substitution of a constitutional government for the provisional government of July—the 12th of July, I think.

MR. LODGE. I have not heard that explanation before. If the ship was kept there to see that there was order at the election and then withdrawn, that may be an explanation.

MR. GRAY. Admiral Walker's correspondence and instructions show it.

MR. LODGE. Admiral Walker, at all events, in his last dispatch, advised that a ship should be continued there. The news of the arrests and royalist conspiracies continued to come through the press dispatches. They, too, are matters of public notoriety. Finally the outbreak came. The path was entirely clear for it: our ship had been withdrawn; the English ship had been

withdrawn very recently, and there remained only the Japanese cruiser *Esmeralda*, which Japan had purchased from Chile. That is the sequence of events as they happened, and every one has a right to draw conclusions from them. My own are very clear.

My belief is that this administration is avowedly and openly hostile to the Hawaiian Government, and the defenders of the administration on this floor to-day have passed most of their time in denouncing that government. The refusal of the electoral right to the natives of that island, the preventing the natives of Hawaii from voting, has filled the soul of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. George] with horror. The idea that any man should be deprived of the right of suffrage is abhorrent to him. The character of the present government has been dwelt upon and criticised with great acrimony. But I do not understand that the Senators are advocating the royalist government, and yet it is between these two governments that we are obliged to choose.

The Senator from Delaware cited with much earnestness yesterday the statement of President Dole, as reported by our intelligent "diplomatic representative," Mr. Willis. President Dole is reported to have said, after this attempted revolution had occurred, "that he was glad that no American ship was there," — a very natural exclamation under the circumstances, — because his government had shown that it had the strength to maintain itself; although I should like very much to know more fully than a telegraphic dispatch can give it, exactly just what he said in that relation. It is advanced, however, as a justification here for sending no ship to Hawaii and for the withdrawal of our ships, that President Dole declared that he was glad there was no ship there; and

yet the moment he makes that declaration, the administration sends a ship! It is impossible to make the testimony of President Dole work well both ways.

But I believe, Mr. President, that the time has gone by in this country to bicker and dispute over what has happened in the past, over the conduct of Mr. Stevens, or the conduct of Mr. Blount, or the policy of this administration. It seems to me that our first duty now is, to give protection to the great American interests and to American property and American citizens in those islands. When the statement of President Dole is urged with such force, Senators overlook entirely that there is an interest above Hawaiian interests, as I regard it, and that is the interest of the United States. Our own interests always seem to be forgotten in the debate by Senators on the other side. It is always the British interest, or the Japanese interest, or the Hawaiian interest. But there is an interest of higher importance in my mind than any of them, and that is the interest of the United States of America. I am not prepared to concede that we should stop at the point of simply protecting American citizens and American property in those islands. I think we ought, with those islands in the disturbed state in which they have been, to keep a naval force there for the protection of American property and American citizens; but I think we have incurred much larger and much greater responsibility than this. The Senate has passed a resolution in which it solemnly declared that we should regard the interference of any other nation in those islands as an act of hostility; which is equivalent to saying that we should regard it practically as a *casus belli* if any other nation interfered with them.

MR. KYLE. I suggest to the Senator that I have the

exact amount of American investments in the islands here, giving the annual amounts.

MR. LODGE. I should be very glad if the Senator would put that in later. My time is limited, otherwise I should be glad to yield to him now.

MR. BUTLER. Before the Senator proceeds, I should be very much obliged if he would inform the Senate in what respect American property or American interests have been endangered or jeopardized in the Sandwich Islands. Has the Senator any proof whatever of it?

MR. LODGE. I think they were jeopardized by the removal of our ships of war.

MR. BUTLER. In what respect? Has the Senator any proof whatever that one iota of American interests in those islands has been affected by the withdrawal of the ships?

MR. LODGE. The fact that the islands were in a disturbed state, and that an insurrection had broken out, shows that American interests were in danger at any moment. This administration has sent the Castine twelve thousand miles to Madagascar to look after American interests there, because there is a war between France and the Hovas. Are American interests in danger in Madagascar? Not that I know of, nor has any proof been brought to us. But because the administration considered that in a disturbed country American interests might be in danger, they properly, in my judgment, sent a ship to Madagascar. On the same ground I think a ship ought to have been sent to the Hawaiian Islands, which is only twenty-five hundred miles away.

MR. BUTLER. Does the Senator see any necessity why a ship should be kept there?

MR. LODGE. I do. That is the exact point.

MR. BUTLER. That is about the only point, as I understand. There has not been, as I understand (if there has been I should be glad to be informed of it), the slightest proof before the Senate that a single American citizen or the interests of a single man from this country have been jeopardized or affected in the slightest degree by the withdrawal of that ship.

MR. LODGE. It is the uniform custom of every nation when there is a revolution and disturbance in another country to send ships of war there to protect its interests, whether those interests have been actually assailed or not. We have sent ships to China, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman] suggests, for the same reason; it is constantly done, and my belief is that these vessels were taken out of the way to give clear road for an attempt to restore the Queen. I think they ought to have been there just at the time of the revolution, in order to protect American interests.

But, Mr. President, I do not stop at the point of protecting American property. We passed this resolution, and we have assumed responsibility when we warned all other nations to hold their hands off from those islands. Our relations with those islands are totally different from our relations with any other country outside of the United States. When we have warned off other nations in that way, we assume great responsibility; we say to the people in those islands that nobody else shall go there, that we shall regard it as an act of hostility if they do, and I think we owe it to them to assist them in the maintenance of peace and order. I believe that the only way now to deal with this question is to annex those islands. We have got to the point where we must settle this matter conclusively. I have no question in my own mind but

that to-day there is a majority for annexation in both Houses of Congress; that it will be still larger in the next Congress; and that there is an overwhelming majority of the American people who believe that we should control those islands, and put an end to the disorders which exist there. If this Hawaiian Republic which now maintains order there is unjust in some of the provisions of law, we can remedy it if we take the islands; but to stand as we do in the attitude of a dog in the manger, allowing nobody to go there, taking our ships away at crucial moments, leaving the islands open to disorder, a breeder of trouble with Japan, a breeder of trouble with Great Britain possibly, is a policy utterly mistaken. It may, perhaps, seem unintelligible to some Senators, but the only motive I have in the matter is because I dislike to see American interests sacrificed. It may be merely a sentimental feeling, although it is one which I cherish very strongly; but I cannot bear to see the American flag pulled down where it has once been run up, and I dislike to see the American foot go back where it has once been advanced.

NAVAL POLICY OF THE UNITED
STATES

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, MARCH 2, 1895.

NAVAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8665) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes —

MR. LODGE said : —

MR. PRESIDENT: I am not concerned to discuss the proceedings of the Paris Tribunal, to which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Pettigrew] has given so much attention this evening. Still less is it necessary for me to say anything in defense of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Morgan], who is quite able to defend himself. But I will say this much, that although his diplomacy may not reach to the high intellectual standard of the Senator from South Dakota, I think if we were to follow the Senator from Alabama in the foreign policy of the United States, it would make very greatly for the welfare and the development of the country.

I am not concerned either, Mr. President, to enter into the discussion of the people of Hawaii, whom the Senator from South Dakota has so freely abused by means of newspaper extracts to-night. I do not think that these are the vital questions involved here, so far as the people of the United States are concerned. Those islands, even if they were populated by a low race of savages, even if they were desert rocks, would still be important to this country from their position. On that ground, and on that ground alone, we ought to control and possess them.

That they have a great commerce and fertile soil merely adds to the desirability of our taking them. The main thing is that those islands lie there in the heart of the Pacific, the controlling point in the commerce of that great ocean. It has always been the policy of the United States to keep control of the Sandwich Islands, and from that policy there has never been known change or departure by any party of any name until within the last two years. It is now proposed to take the first step toward finally establishing our control in Hawaii, by beginning a cable to those islands. To my mind it is the most important thing involved in any appropriation bill before Congress, for I consider that upon those islands rests a great part of the future commercial progress of the United States.

The sea power has been one of the controlling forces in history. Without the sea power no nation has been really great. Sea power consists, in the first place, of a proper navy and a proper fleet; but in order to sustain a navy we must have suitable posts for naval stations, strong places where a navy can be protected and refurnished. I will, with the permission of the Senate, now ask leave to present a map, because I can save time by so doing. It will save my rehearsing a long list of names which describe very imperfectly the situation which I desire to depict as illustrating what is to me the controlling feature in the question of the Sandwich Islands. [A map was brought into the Chamber.]

That map illustrates the point which I desire to make in regard to these islands. These red crosses [indicating], one here at Cape Breton, one here at Halifax, Bermuda, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, are the British naval stations on the Atlantic coast of the United States — six



The points marked with a maltese cross are British naval stations and fortified places. The black lines in the Pacific and Atlantic oceans indicate the tonnage of British war ships and those of the United States. The upper black line in each case shows the British and the lower the United States tonnage of war ships in each ocean.

powerful places of arms and naval stations. The upper black line [indicating] is the tonnage of the British war-ships in the Atlantic, and that lower black line [indicating] is the tonnage of American war-ships. Here, these crosses represent British naval stations in the East and about Australia. Now, every one can see here at the Falkland Islands is a British naval station [indicating]. Here is another at Vancouver. Here is another at the Fiji Islands. In that great triangle marked by these three points [indicating] Great Britain does not hold a naval station. There in the centre of that triangle [indicating], in the heart of the Pacific, where I am now pointing, lie the Sandwich Islands. They are the key of the Pacific. If we are ever to build the Nicaraguan Canal, it would be folly to enter upon it if we were not prepared to take possession of those islands. There is the tonnage of the British war-ships in the Pacific [indicating]. There is the tonnage of the American war-ships [indicating].

MR. PETTIGREW. One question. I should like to know how long those war-ships of ours would prevent the British war-ships from taking those islands.

MR. LODGE. The Senator from South Dakota inquires how long I think those war-ships of ours would prevent the British war-ships from taking those islands. That is a curious question to come from a Senator a large part of whose speech was devoted to sneers at fear of England. But, Mr. President, for my part I fear England so little that I think if the flag of the United States were to be once hoisted over the Sandwich Islands the nation does not now exist that would be able to pull it down.

Mr. President, it is on account of the military and strategic importance of the Sandwich Islands that I so greatly desire their control by the United States. They

are particularly important, as I have said, if we once open, as I hope we shall open, the Nicaraguan Canal. All the great routes from San Francisco and from Vancouver, all the great routes to the East, to and from the Nicaraguan Canal, pass those islands. Those islands came here and offered themselves to this country. They were refused. We now have an opportunity to unite them to us, and the first step is a cable. In the hands of this country they would rapidly increase in population, and they would be a source of wealth and strength. I have no desire to see this country enter on an unlimited career of acquisition of colonial possessions. That is not necessary to us. It is not consonant to the principles of our government. But, Mr. President, as I have said once before, in speaking on this subject, we hold the citadel of our greatness here on this continent within the borders of the United States, but we should not neglect the necessary outworks. That red line [indicating] which goes down the Atlantic coast shows the foresight of England. Does any one suppose that that naval station at the Bermudas was placed there because England did not have enough naval stations? She put it there because it is only a little over six hundred miles from New York. I have no idea that England desires to go to war with this country. I do not think she does; but we may as well look facts in the face. This country is the rival and competitor of England for the trade and commerce of the world. The English-speaking people have been the great conquering race of modern times. The American colonies sprang from their loins; and since we parted from England her statesmen have never failed to recognize that in men speaking her language, and of her own race she was to find her most formidable rivals. She has always opposed, thwarted, and

sought to injure us. She desires to keep her control of the great pathways of commerce. She desires to put us in a position where we cannot fight, if we wish, except at a great disadvantage. I have said that I do not fear a war. I do not think we have any reason to. England is quite as well aware as we are that, though she might bombard a few of our coast cities, her great territory of Canada in the event of a war would pass from her never to return. It would be as the Sultan said after the war in which he met the great disaster of the battle of Lepanto, but in which he got possession of the Island of Cyprus. He said: "You have singed my beard, but I have cut off your arms." We should cut off one of England's arms, in the case of a war, by taking Canada, and I have no idea that she would precipitate such a conflict.

But, Mr. President, to neglect our navy and the outlying islands which ought to belong to us, puts us in the position where all the advantage is on her side and none on ours. The control of these great points in the highways of commerce are the control of the sea power. It was the sea power in history which enabled Rome to crush Hannibal, perhaps the greatest military genius of all time; it was the sea power which enabled England to bring Napoleon's empire to ruin; it was the sea power more than anything else which crushed the rebellion in this country by blockading every port of the Southern States. It is the sea power which is essential to the greatness of every splendid people. We are a great people; we control this continent; we are dominant in this hemisphere; we have too great an inheritance to be trifled with or parted with. It is ours to guard and to extend. We do not want too great a rival posted too near our coasts; and there, in the one

place where the hand of England has not yet been reached out, to throw away those islands is madness, and must seem so to any man who looks beyond the present moment or who sees in this question anything but a mere matter of population or money.

It matters not whether this cable costs four millions or forty millions, the question is whether we shall maintain the true American policy of the United States. It has been the policy of Marcy and Seward; it has been the policy of both parties; it is the American policy; and closely joined with it is the question of the navy, which will come before us later. Mr. President, I desire an extra session as little as any man in this body, but I would never vote to strike out that cable, because it is the first step toward the development of American commerce, toward the taking of what belongs as of right to the American people in their onward march. I would never vote to strike it out if it meant ten extra sessions. It is part of a great policy. It is not a mere appropriation of \$500,000.

.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8665) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes.

MR. LODGE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the reduction proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the number of the battleships authorized by the House. That number was recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, and has been authorized by the House

of Representatives. I think it is not an excessive authorization, in view of the fact that last year no authorization was made for any new ships whatever. I am also opposed to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations striking out six torpedo boats and reducing their number to three. I think we should preserve the number embodied in the bill by the House. I am quite willing, in fact I should be glad, to add the six gunboats proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, for I do not think there is any danger of our doing too much in the direction of building up the navy. I believe, on the contrary, that there is far more danger that we shall do too little.

The question as to how large a navy we shall maintain is not the only one here, for whether the navy be large or small it must be properly balanced in its different branches. That is not the case with the vessels that we now have, either built or in process of construction. The cruiser class, as it is known, is in our navy numerous — out of proportion to the other arms of the service. The backbone of the modern navy, that which makes it a formidable fighting force for purposes of defense, is the battleship. To-day we have an illustration of this fact in the condition of affairs in the Eastern waters. Any one who has read the account of the fighting there is aware that the Japanese have shown great capacity in their naval battles; but they have no battleships, and the result is that Russia, although with a very much smaller fleet in those waters, is capable of dominating the Japanese in that region, simply because Russia has one powerful modern battleship present, against which no unarmored cruiser could possibly stand.

We do not need in a modern navy a large proportion of battleships, but we do need a certain proportion. In our

navy we have altogether too few. It is essential, in my judgment, that we should authorize and build those large armored ships as rapidly as possible. At best it is a very slow work. Despite the great advances made in this country in the building of ships of war, we still move very slowly. The last two battleships authorized by Great Britain (the *Majestic*, I think, is one; I do not remember at this moment the name of the other) were launched within one year after the keels were laid. We have not yet reached such a point of speed in construction. It is therefore more important for us to make liberal authorizations, because more time will be consumed in the construction of ships, and we need an efficient navy now.

The new navy of the United States was begun under the administration of President Arthur by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Chandler], who at that time was Secretary of the Navy. I have never thought that the Senator from New Hampshire has received all the credit that was due to him for the great work that he then did. It was not merely that he put a stop to the old and vicious practice of repairing worthless wooden ships, but he broke up an old and bad system of naval administration. He was the pioneer; he was the man who first began the work out of which the new navy has risen, and it was this first step which was most difficult. The four ships authorized at that time are all useful and good ships to-day, too small, perhaps, according to the more recent ideas of naval architecture, but all good ships and of effective fighting capacity. The Senator from New Hampshire was succeeded by a Democrat, Secretary Whitney. He took up the work of building new ships where Mr. Chandler had left it. He was supported in his work by a Republican Senate. He in turn was succeeded

by a Republican Secretary of the Navy, and he was sustained in one Congress by a Democratic House. We now have again a Democratic Secretary, who is continuing the policy of his predecessors. He has recommended, very wisely, that we should have three battle-ships and nine torpedo boats, recognizing that in those two great arms of the modern navy we are still very deficient. I think, Mr. President, that it would be a great mistake for us to hesitate to adopt his well-considered recommendation.

The purpose of a navy is twofold. We require it first for what may be called police purposes, to send to foreign ports where American interests require protection. Within the past few months we have seen the necessity of an American war-ship at Madagascar, of another at Bluefields. Another has just been sent to Colombia, and another was sent to Honolulu, and, unfortunately, afterwards withdrawn. I mention these cases merely as illustrations of one function of the navy, the police purposes; and the navy is important in that direction to commerce. Commerce with distant countries will not be undertaken by the people of a nation which does not give adequate naval protection. Commerce follows the flag. I do not mean to say that the building up of a great navy necessarily builds up a great commerce, but I do say that without a sufficiently powerful navy it is impossible to take a place among the great commercial nations of the world. It is one of the essential conditions of a great and world-wide commerce. Of that commerce we do not to-day have our proper share. I hope to see it developed by wise legislation. I hope to see it nursed, encouraged, subsidized as England has wisely subsidized hers. Then, backed by a navy, we shall soon cease to pay out in freights vast sums

of money, which to-day constitute the heaviest drain upon the gold resources of the country.

That is one function of the navy. The other function is that of national defense. We have great coasts on the Atlantic and the Pacific. The work of land fortification proceeds of necessity very slowly. Modern war, moreover, has demonstrated that in many cases, in most cases perhaps, land fortifications are unable to cope with modern ships of war. From the time of Farragut's great fights at New Orleans and Mobile, the power of ships to pass fortifications has been established. The defense of the coast, then, must lie in the navy of the country. It is the easiest, the cheapest, and the surest method of defense. I should not advocate the building of a navy as large as that of England. It is totally unnecessary. England is obliged to keep ships in all parts of the world. Even if war were to come, she could not strip the Channel of a fleet. She would have to keep ships in the Mediterranean. She would be obliged to keep still other ships to guard her great possessions in the East. But we, Mr. President, ought to have a navy strong enough to meet and fight at sea any fleet which England or any other country could in time of war bring against our coast. There is, I repeat, no simpler, no surer, no cheaper method of defense. Moreover, although we naturally think of England as the great danger to this country when we speak of war, as the country with which we are more likely, perhaps, to have war, if a war is to come, than with any other nation, it is well not to forget that there has arisen in the East a new sea power. Japan has won lately some naval victories which have impressed greatly all students of those subjects. I noticed on the other side, when I referred some days ago to Japan as a danger in connection with

Hawaii, there was a disposition to laugh at it and to sneer at our being troubled about the Japanese.

Mr. President, I have here upon my desk an article from the London "Spectator," a journal of the very highest standing, called "The Warning of Wei-Hai-Wei," where the last naval fight took place. I will not detain the Senate by reading the article, but I will print it with what I have said to-day. It is pointed out in that article that Japan is a threatening danger to England in the East; that she is a great rising naval power. There I find described the fight at Wei-Hai-Wei, where the Japanese torpedo boats went in and destroyed the Chinese ships. The second attack made by those boats, the second and successful attack of the Japanese torpedo boats, was a great feat of war. They went in in weather so bitter and so cold that in one of the boat's crew, when they struck the Chinese ship, the lieutenant and two of the men on the boat were frozen to death at their posts. Yet those boats went on, and went on victoriously, and destroyed the Chinese cruisers. I refer to that battle, Mr. President, merely to show that the Japanese have displayed the qualities of a great fighting race at sea. They understand their future; they realize the prospects which are opening up before them; they have already ordered two battleships of fourteen thousand tons each of the latest modern type. They propose to make themselves the sea power of the East; and if they get indemnity, as they undoubtedly will, from China, they will build more ships. There they are, our nearest neighbor on the Pacific; there they are, with Hawaii lying halfway between us. Remember that they are a new people; they have just whipped somebody, and they are in a state of mind when they think they can whip anybody. It is a

very dangerous state of mind for any people to be in, dangerous for themselves and for others. Although I have but very little doubt of the result to Japan if she should get into a war with England, or with France, or with Russia, or with the United States, yet the surest way to prevent such a war, and avoid such a danger at Hawaii or upon our Pacific coast, is to have a fleet the mere existence of which is a guarantee of peace.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland used the argument, which I have heard used so many times, that naval types rapidly became obsolete, and that the new ships must in time be repaired. That argument, pressed to its logical conclusion, would mean that we should never have any ships or any navy at all. It would be just as reasonable to say that we must give up the army because rifles had been invented so deadly that it would not be worth while to organize an army until we could determine whether there was not some other rifle to be found more deadly still.

MR. GORMAN. I know the Senator from Massachusetts does not desire to misrepresent me.

MR. LODGE. Certainly not, Mr. President.

MR. GORMAN. I made no such statement to-day, and I have never done so.

MR. LODGE. I did not intend to quote the Senator as saying what I have said about the army. I used that merely as an illustration.

MR. GORMAN. Nor about the navy. I have declared distinctly on every appropriation bill for the past twelve years that I was in favor of, and I have voted for, the construction of all of these classes of vessels, from torpedo boats to battleships. My suggestion was that it was not wise to go on too rapidly with the improvements which

are being made, and which were made under Secretary Whitney, Secretary Tracy, and Secretary Chandler; and I believe improvements will continue to be made both in armor and in guns; and, therefore, the wise policy was, while going on with moderate progress, not to make too great an increase at once.

MR. LODGE. I know the Senator from Maryland has always been a friend to the navy, and has always hitherto, at least, voted for the fullest appropriations for that purpose; but I thought that he used an argument which I have heard many times in the other House when I have had occasion to discuss naval matters, and which, it seems to me, if pressed to a logical conclusion, means that we should build no navy at all. If the Senator uses it merely as an argument for moderation in building, then I can only say that I think the proposition of the House of Representatives for the construction of the navy is a moderate and reasonable one.

Mr. President, I do not regard the navy of the United States as a question in which the inhabitants of the coast alone have an interest. It is to me a great national interest, associated with national dignity, national honor, and the protection of the flag. It is also to me an integral part of our foreign policy and an essential element of our commercial policy. I think that of late years too much attention has been given to small matters of legislation, too much, perhaps, to economic questions, and too little attention to those great and far-reaching issues on which the future of the republic depends. We have spent enough money in building ugly public buildings alone, to fit out the greatest navy in the world. I am not opposed to public buildings; I think it is proper to build them. I am not opposed to them, and have never voted

against proper appropriations in any interest in any part of the country, and I never mean to, for I do not believe in an illiberal policy for the Government of the United States. But this question seems to me to be one wholly above all local interests, one in which the national honor and the national interest are at stake, one on which depends the right foreign policy of the country. A navy is necessary to the defense of our coast, to the defense of our honor, to the protection of Americans everywhere in the world.

Mr. President, the proposition of the House of Representatives is moderate, and I think it ought to receive the support of every one who believes in the necessity of giving to the United States the navy to which she is entitled. We need no great army; we do need a great navy, so that there should not be a nation in the world that could attack us with any hope of success.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, DECEMBER 30, 1895.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

MR. PRESIDENT: On the first day of the session I introduced a joint resolution reciting the declaration made by Mr. Monroe in his message of December, 1823, and giving to that declaration the formal sanction of Congress. I had not intended to address the Senate upon that resolution until it had received the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, as I ventured to hope, been favorably reported by them. But since then the President has sent in his message on the Venezuelan difficulty, and Congress, without a dissenting voice, has authorized the commission which the President requested. This action on the part of the President and of Congress has led to a great deal of discussion and much wild talk. Those persons in this country who, for one reason or another, believe that we should never do anything which can clash with English interests have filled the air with their cries and lamentations. It is true that they are more vocal than numerous, but they are very vocal indeed. This outcry, however, coupled with London's attempt to frighten Congress by producing a stock panic, has tended to confuse the issue and to mislead many persons. When men, usually sane, cable to London such frantic nonsense as that the Senate is controlled by a jingo mob in the galleries, by "the gentlemen of the pavement" like the French convention during the Reign of Terror, it seems as if a little cool

explanation of the real situation would not be out of place. I shall therefore venture to ask the attention of the Senate while I state very briefly the case upon which the President and Congress, charged with the heavy responsibility of government, have acted without a dissenting voice. I shall try to show what the Monroe Doctrine is, what it means to the United States, and that it is vitally involved in this Venezuelan controversy. I shall also show that this is not a petty question of a South American boundary, but one in which, so far as it concerns us, the safety and the honor of the United States and its place in the scale of nations are all deeply involved.

These are the gravest questions which can confront any people, and must be treated by those charged with the conduct of public affairs with dignity, calmness, and firmness. Wild denunciation of public men responsible for the nation's peace and safety and bound to protect her rights are as wholly out of place on the one hand as bluster, threats, and violent language are on the other. The war scare and the war talk do not come from those charged with the responsibility of government, but from outside these walls, and chiefly from the stock market and from the meetings of the advocates of peace. No responsible public man, let me say now, desires war, or seeks in any way to promote it. We do not believe, here at least, that there is any danger of war; but we are all agreed that honorable peace can be most surely maintained by a firm and temperate upholding of the rights and interests of our country.

Two cardinal principles have always governed the United States in their relations with foreign nations. Although in late years these two principles may have been lost sight of, they have never been departed from. The first was

laid down by Washington, in what was known at the time as the neutrality policy. The doctrine then declared was that we intended as a nation to hold ourselves entirely aloof from European politics, to form no entangling alliances, and to take no part in the affairs of Europe. To-day this proposition seems like a truism, but when it was declared by Washington with reference to the great struggle then going on between France and the rest of Europe it aroused a storm of opposition. As British colonies we had necessarily been involved in European affairs wherever England was engaged. A war in Europe, whether dynastic or territorial, reached always to the American continent. The question of the Spanish succession filled New York and New England with the horrors of Indian warfare, and when Frederick the Great faced all Europe in arms, Pitt declared that he would conquer Canada upon the plains of Germany. Thus the colonists of North America had come to look across the Atlantic to know whether they would have war or peace, and the habits of thought of one hundred and fifty years were not effaced by the fact that we had achieved our political independence.

When the struggle of the French Revolution began, Americans, still under the influence of the colonial traditions, felt with a natural sympathy that they should join hands with the nation which had helped them to gain their independence. But if this view was natural, it was also colonial. Fortunately for us, we had at the head of our government a great statesman, who saw, with the clear vision which no passion could dim, that the policy befitting the colonies was wholly unsuited to a nation. As a part of the British Empire, the struggles of Europe were vital to us. As the United States of America, as a free and

independent nation, we had no concern with them. So Washington laid down the principle of neutrality in the European wars then raging, and maintained it in the midst of obloquy and attack. It was left to a later generation to appreciate rightly the far-reaching wisdom and the high courage which dictated the action of our great first President. When Washington went out of office and gave to the country his Farewell Address, he stated the principle which he had carried into action in words which cannot be improved, and which have been the guide of all succeeding statesmen in the United States upon this point from that day to this:—

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own stand to go upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

In the years immediately following the retirement of Washington the Government of the United States, despite the change of parties in control of the administration, adhered strictly to Washington's policy. For the protection of American citizens abroad they fought a naval war with the Barbary States, but held rigidly aloof from any connection with European affairs during the troublous times of the First Empire. After the downfall of Napoleon, however, matters in Europe took a new turn. The Holy Alliance, consisting of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, was formed, with the avowed object of restoring and maintaining the old forms of absolutism which had really been destroyed in the French Revolution, although the statesmen of the Holy Alliance were unable to understand it.

At the congress of Aix la Chapelle in 1818, the views of the Holy Alliance as to the necessity of suppressing all movements against absolutism were strongly advocated. In 1820 another congress was held at Troppau and later at Laybach, and there it was proposed to unite in repressing the revolution which had broken out in Naples. England protested, and Austria suppressed the revolt alone. In 1822 another congress met at Verona, this time to deal with the affairs of Spain. There was an insurrection in the peninsula itself, and the Spanish-American colonies were in open revolt. Again it was proposed that the great powers should unite in suppressing these revolutionary movements, and again England declined to take part. A French army crossed the Pyrenees and suppressed the

insurrection in Spain. The Holy Alliance desired to go still further, and reduce the revolted colonies to subjection. Against this Canning vigorously protested, and it was to this he referred in later times when he made the famous declaration that he had called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old. In pursuance of this policy, Mr. Canning, in August, 1823, proposed to our minister, Mr. Rush, that England and the United States should publish a joint declaration to the effect that, while these two governments desired no portion of these colonies for themselves, they would not view with indifference any foreign intervention in their affairs or their acquisition by any third power. Mr. Rush replied that the United States would join in this declaration, provided that England would acknowledge the independence of the Spanish colonies. This Mr. Canning declined to do at the moment, but he, at the same time, announced to the Prince de Polignac that Great Britain would not permit any European intervention in Spanish-American affairs. It is interesting to observe that the first public proposition looking to the exclusion of Europe from the Western Hemisphere was made by Great Britain, and accompanied by a renunciation, on her part, of any desire to acquire new territory there herself.

The schemes of the Holy Alliance made it clear to American statesmen that the time had come when the United States must adopt and declare her policy with reference to the relations of Europe with the Western Hemisphere. Just at the time when Mr. Canning was making his proposals to Mr. Rush, in July, 1823, John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, said to Baron Tuyl, the Russian minister, that "we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that

the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments." The question of our policy in regard to the relations of Europe with the Americas, owing to the projects of the Holy Alliance, had assumed such gravity and importance that President Monroe asked upon it the opinions of Madison and Jefferson. Mr. Madison replied that our relations to the new republics were such as to call for our efforts to defeat the meditated crusade. Mr. Jefferson said: —

The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe.

The words of Jefferson may be commended to the attention of those persons who think the operations of a foreign power in South America of less importance than the temporary price of stocks.

The result of the consultations thus held by President Monroe and of the views of Mr. Adams, which he strongly urged, appeared in the following passages of the President's message of December 2, 1823: —

In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved,

that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. . . .

In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. . . .

We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system in any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European powers we have not interfered and shall not interfere ; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

These extracts contain what has ever since been known as the Monroe Doctrine. The principle which it laid down was the necessary corollary of Washington's neutrality policy, and covered three points. First, no more European colonies on these continents ; second, no extension of the European political system to any portion of this hemisphere ; third, no European interposition in the affairs of the Spanish-American republics. That part of the declaration which related to European intervention was

received by Great Britain with approval, and was warmly praised by Mr. Brougham, Sir James McIntosh, and Lord John Russell, some of whose remarks have been already quoted to the Senate by the Senator from Illinois in his able speech upon this question. In the succeeding administration President Adams, who may be considered as the real author of the Monroe Doctrine, and Mr. Clay, then Secretary of State, attempted to draw closer the bond between ourselves and the South American republics by the Panama Congress, and Mr. Adams reiterated the Monroe Doctrine in his message of March 15, 1826. In the course of the debate upon sending the delegates to the Panama Congress, Mr. Webster spoke as follows:—

I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be by any act of mine blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame.

The Panama Congress, owing to the question of slavery, came to nothing so far as the United States was concerned; but the passages which I have quoted show sufficiently the view taken of the doctrine by our leading statesmen at the period of its declaration. In 1845 President Polk reiterated the Monroe Doctrine, and spoke as follows:—

The existing rights of every European nation should be respected; but it is due alike to our safety and our interests that the efficient protection of our laws should be extended over our whole territorial limits, and that it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American Continent.

Three years later, President Polk, in a special message, called the attention of Congress to the appeal of the white population of Yucatan for help against the Indians. They offered to transfer Yucatan to the United States. The President stated that while he did not recommend the acquisition of Yucatan, he advised its temporary occupation in order to prevent its passing into the hands of any European power, which would be an infringement of the Monroe Doctrine. A bill was introduced for the occupation of Yucatan, and was opposed by Mr. Calhoun, on the ground that the Monroe Doctrine was only intended for the temporary purpose of resisting the schemes of the Holy Alliance. The war in Yucatan came to an end, and the bill never reached a vote. The incident is of interest only as showing that Mr. Polk's administration sustained the Monroe Doctrine in its widest application, and that Mr. Calhoun is the only American statesman of any standing who has tried to limit its scope.

Thus far I have merely sketched the history of the Doctrine, to show the view taken of it by all our administrations and by all our statesmen, with one exception. I now come to the only attempt which has been made by an outside power to break down the Monroe Doctrine and set it at naught. In 1861 Great Britain, France, and Spain entered into a convention to unite in compelling the payment of certain claims which they held against Mexico. When the allied troops disembarked at Vera Cruz, it was discovered that the Emperor of the French intended to go much further than had been agreed upon, and to do nothing less than place an Austrian prince upon the Mexican throne. Thereupon England and Spain withdrew, and France was left to carry on her design alone. At that time our hands were tied by our great Civil War,

but we at once demanded explanation from France, and continued to protest against her conduct. During the entire period of the French occupation we recognized only the government of Juarez. Mr. Seward consistently pressed our views upon France, and the proceedings of the French were denounced in Congress with so much indignation that in 1863 we were on the verge of war. The moment the Civil War was over Mr. Seward demanded the withdrawal of the French troops. Our hands were free, and General Sheridan, with a powerful army, was ordered to the Mexican frontier. Under this pressure, after some months of diplomatic delay, the Emperor was forced to give way. The French troops were withdrawn, and the Emperor's Mexican conspiracy, which had begun with treachery and bad faith, ended in humiliation, failure, and the execution of the unfortunate Maximilian. When Napoleon sent out his expedition, English writers hastened to declare that he had done a great political service by extinguishing the Monroe Doctrine; but when our war was over and we had forced the French armies from Mexico and destroyed the wretched empire they had tried to set up, it was plainly seen that the Monroe Doctrine had been signally vindicated, and that an attempt to infringe it had brought nothing but shame and disaster to the European power which had made the experiment. Sir Edward Creasy, a distinguished historian, with a greater sense of truth than those writers who had exulted over the buccaneering enterprises of the French, speaks as follows in his "First Platform of International Law": —

The United States (occupied by their own Civil War which was then raging) did not actually send troops to oppose the French in Mexico, but they steadily refused to recognize Maximilian,

or any other government except a republican government, in Mexico; and the language of their statesmen exhibited the fullest development of the Monroe Doctrine.

Since 1823 there have been many cases in which the Monroe Doctrine has been cited and discussed, but until the present time the French invasion of Mexico has been the only instance in which it has been openly disregarded and actually infringed by a European power. A second case has now arisen, and the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine is again threatened as it was by the French in 1862. This second attack upon the principles of the Monroe Doctrine comes from Great Britain, and is made under cover of a boundary dispute with Venezuela, while Lord Salisbury in his letter to Mr. Olney openly assails the validity of the doctrine itself. To understand the importance of this controversy and how deeply the very existence of the Monroe Doctrine is involved in it, it will be necessary to trace very briefly the history of the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, which has now reached a crisis affecting most gravely the honor, the interests, the rights, and the well-settled policy of the United States.

The dispute over the boundaries of Guiana is an inheritance bequeathed to Venezuela and Great Britain by Spain and Holland. The successful revolt in 1810 of the South American colonies of Spain established the independence of what is now known as Venezuela. That independence was finally recognized by Spain in a decree on the 27th of May, 1845, in which Her Catholic Majesty Dona Isabel II expressly renounces the sovereignty of the American territory known "under the old name of Captaincy General of Venezuela, now Republic of Vene-

zuela." Among the thirteen provinces enumerated in this act of renunciation and cession is the Province of Guiana, which measures 20,149 square leagues, while the remainder of the republic measures only 20,149 square leagues. It is the controversy over the control of this vast expanse of territory, rich in minerals, fertile in soil, and drained by navigable rivers, which has now reached such an acute stage.

Great Britain's claim is derived from Holland. By the treaty of the 13th of August, 1814, the establishments of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice were ceded to Great Britain, and the supplemental agreement called for by the terms of the treaty subsequently confirmed this partition. Unfortunately the lines of demarcation between Venezuela and British Guiana were not specifically defined in either of the treaties above mentioned — a circumstance England has not overlooked. It therefore becomes a question of paramount importance in any examination into the merits of this controversy to determine by other means the territorial jurisdiction of Spain in 1810, and of Holland in 1814. The earlier treaties, documents, and ordinances are happily ample and explicit upon these points. Lord Salisbury now puts forward a claim to title based on conquest and military occupation in 1796; but as the treaty which confirms these conquests only describes them as the establishments of Berbice, Demerara, and Essequibo, this new claim does not affect the argument except as a mere assertion.

It is hardly worth while to do more than barely allude to the fact that the northern part of South America belonged to Spain by virtue of original discovery. There is no principle of the law of nations now better established than the doctrine of discovery. Calvo, an eminent authority upon international law, says: —

The discovery of America and those (discoveries) which have been made at the close of the Middle Ages in Asia and Africa have introduced into international law a new mode of acquisition and possession. We speak of the priority of discovery, of the first occupation, and of colonization.

It is beyond dispute that what is now Venezuela and British and Dutch Guiana was originally Spanish territory.

Columbus discovered the mouth of the Orinoco in 1498. In the following year Alonzo de Ojeda, a Spanish subject, made further discoveries in the same region. In 1500 Vicente Yanez Pinzon, a companion of Columbus, explored the principal mouths of the Orinoco. In 1531 Diego de Ordaz navigated this river as far as the mouth of the Meta. These acts of discovery and exploration on the part of Spain were soon followed by colonization. For many years her only rival in South America was Portugal, and in the treaty of 1750 between these two powers Portugal bound herself to recognize and support the right of Spain to territory lying between the Amazon and the Orinoco. Thus Portugal, the only country that can claim with Spain the honor of original discovery, solemnly recognized the justice of the Spanish contention to what is now disputed territory. It is interesting to note in this connection that a few years later (5th of March, 1768) a royal cedula fixed the Amazon as the southern limit of Spanish Guiana.

It was not until the northern coast of Spanish America had been substantially preëmpted by discovery that Holland began to seek a foothold in that part of the New World. During their long war of emancipation the Dutch had succeeded in planting several colonies in Guiana. When Spain, whose vassal Holland had been,

became a party to the treaty of Munster in 1648, she legalized the Dutch pretensions. By article 5 each power was to retain territory already possessed and held in the East and West Indies and on the coast of Asia, Africa, and America. It was further stipulated that neither power should molest or disturb the garrisons and strongholds of the other. This treaty proved to be a fruitful source of misunderstanding and irritation. Each power soon came to accuse the other of violating its provisions. Dutch expeditions beyond the Essequibo were repulsed and driven back by the Spaniards repeatedly, and there is no evidence to show that Spain ever acquiesced for a single moment in the Dutch pretensions to a rood of land west of the Essequibo. On the contrary, when the director-general of the Dutch colony of Essequibo, on the 30th of September, 1758, sent a note of protest to the Spanish authorities complaining that the Spanish troops had molested and driven the Dutch away from a post which stood on one of the banks of the Cuyuni, a vigorous response was returned, saying "that the river Cuyuni and its dependencies belonged to His Catholic Majesty, and that consequently, as the Dutch had entered the Spanish dominion, he would make no restitution." The river referred to there, let me say, is far to the east of the Orinoco and Point Barima, where the Schomburgk line ends.

It does not appear that the Dutch sought to continue further these diplomatic amenities. That they made spasmodic attempts at further extension is unquestioned, and on these Lord Salisbury in his reply to Secretary Olney appears to rely, but it is equally certain that none of their attempts ever attained anything like the dignity of permanent and recognized settlements, or were ever admitted by Spain. Indeed, in 1788 Antonio Lopez de la

Puente, who had been sent by the Spanish governor of Guiana to explore the Cuyuni River as far as the limits of the Dutch colony, presented his report. In it he said :—

That having descended the river as far as the curve which it makes, in order to pour into the Essequibo, where the possessions of the Dutch colonies commence, he found the first Dutch houses at the mouth of the Masaruni, *i. e.* precisely at the curve, no new territories having been encroached upon by them up to that time.

This, then, was the situation in 1791 when, on the 23d of June, a treaty of extradition was concluded at Aranjuez between Spain and Holland. The objects of this treaty, as defined in the preamble, were for “the mutual restoration of deserters and runaways between their respective colonies” and to “put a stop to desertion and its pernicious consequences.” The first article of the treaty recites that “complaints of desertion have been more frequent, to wit, between Puerto Rico, and St. Eustace, Coro and Curacao, the Spanish establishments on the Orinoco and Essequibo, Demerara, Berbice and Surinam.” An examination of the map to-day shows that the British province of Berbice extends from Surinam to the River Berbice, Demerara from the Berbice to the Demerara; and on the same principle the province of Essequibo would extend from the Demerara to the River Essequibo, which may or may not include the valley watered by that stream. We have just seen, also, from the preceding report (1788) that the Dutch establishment of Essequibo did not extend beyond the mouth of the Masaruni, and certainly it is a fair inference to assume that the Dutch themselves did not put forward any serious claim to territory virtually beyond the Essequibo. This presumption is further supported,

indeed, by Dutch testimony of the most unimpeachable sort. No less an official than Mr. Six, secretary of the Dutch East India Company, sent in 1794 a communication to Senor Corral, the Spanish minister to Holland, in which he makes the following significant admission: —

The captain, pilot, and crew of the Spanish merchant ship *Neustra Senora de la Concepcion*, after having been perfectly well treated by the governor-general of Surinam, were conveyed to Moroco, west of the Essequibo, as having been Spanish territory, so that they could thence go as on their own land to the nearest Spanish-American town.

Clearly, then, the River Moroco, by common consent and by the admission of the Dutch in 1794, was a Spanish possession, and the Moroco is far to the east of the Orinoco and the Schomburgk line. There could be no dispute by the Dutch to territory beyond the Moroco. Their broadest claim in 1794 was confined to the few leagues between the Moroco and the Essequibo.

Of the Dutch colonies enumerated in the treaty of Aranjuez, three, to wit, Essequibo, Demerara, and Berbice, as stated at the outset, were substantially ceded to England by the treaty of London of the 13th of August, 1814. By this act of alienation England succeeded to the title of Holland. England is entitled to every foot of territory that was Dutch in 1814, and to nothing more. Venezuela is heir to the rights of Spain and nothing more. No act of aggression or encroachment since can change or alter the relative position of the two countries. No new rights have accrued to either side since the 13th of August, 1814.

What Holland's claim included in 1791 and 1794 we have already seen. It is absurd to say that any Dutch

aggressions beyond the Essequibo subsequent to 1794 and prior to 1814 conveyed to Holland any color of title by prescription. A period of something less than a quarter of a century is hardly "time immemorial" within the meaning of the rule. Neither will it be seriously contended that such Dutch occupation of disputed territory as did occur was "peaceable." It is manifest, then, that any claim to a title by prescription must be invalid. Still less is it necessary to fortify Spain's claim by any supplemental quotations from further ordinances and decrees. It may be said in passing, however, that the list is by no means exhausted. Among other additional and confirmatory evidence that the Spanish boundary terminated only with the Essequibo, reference may be had to the following documents: Note of Gregorio Espinosa, governor of Cumana, 1st of February, 1742; order of 4th of February, 1779, giving directions for establishing settlements in the eastern part of Guiana; report of Felipe de Inciarte, 1st of November, 1779; royal mandate of 1st of October, 1780, commanding the aforesaid Inciarte to drive the Dutch away from land at the northwest of the Essequibo as "trespassers."

We have, however, very fortunately, some important independent testimony as to the boundaries during this period between 1794 and 1814. In 1801-04 the French geographer and agent of the French government at Caracas explored this country, and published the result of his explorations and of his examination of historical documents in three volumes, with maps, in 1805. Mr. De Pons says: "These boundaries are established by treaties at the River Essequibo, forty leagues or more southward of the Orinoco." He then adds, "The Dutch have, disregarding treaty lines, encroached on the Spanish possessions eight

or ten leagues running northwest, and encouraged the Carib Indians" — then under Spanish dominion — "not to recognize any foreign power." He shows at length how the Spaniards have repeatedly declared this region to be theirs and have planted in it some forty villages. In his map he gives to the Dutch their encroachment of eight or ten leagues, extending to Cape Nassau, some thirty leagues from the mouth of the Orinoco, the point of the modern British claims. In 1820-23 William Sabon, geographer to the King and to the Prince of Wales, published a map, in which he gives the same boundaries to the British possessions as De Pons gave to the Dutch, very clear proof that at the time of the treaty of 1814, and for several years after, England, so far as her geographers knew, made no claim whatever to any land west of Cape Nassau. Maps, of course, abound. There are many of the eighteenth century and earlier, made for the most part by men who had never left their own country, which give every sort of boundary. These are of value only as showing the opinion of the map-maker. The importance of the De Pons map is that it was made by a man who had thoroughly explored the country, and that it was accepted as authoritative by English geographers as late as 1823.

Having determined at some length and with reasonable precision the western limitations of Dutch Guiana, to which, and to which only, England succeeded in 1814, it now becomes pertinent and proper to inquire how far England has respected or rather ignored these boundaries, and to trace step by step her aggressions upon the soil of her weaker neighbor. For many years the question of boundary between Venezuela and England was held in abeyance. Venezuela for a long time was a part of the old Columbian Confederation, and too busy with her own

internal problems to pay much heed to the more remote question of the boundary of her eastern frontier. Perhaps the earliest, as it certainly is one of the most significant, incidents of this whole controversy occurred in 1836. On the 26th of May of that year Sir Robert Ker Porter, the then British minister at Caracas, requested the Venezuelan government in an official note to place lighthouses and other marks at Point Barima, at the mouth of the Orinoco River, as an aid to navigation. This voluntary act of Sir Robert Ker Porter was a most complete admission of Venezuela's sovereignty over the Orinoco. The modern British claim that the Dutch had occupied Point Barima long before the treaty of Munster probably did not occur to Sir Robert. Indeed, it seems altogether likely that he only had in mind the treaty of Aranjuez of 1791, already alluded to, in which the Dutch themselves distinctly recognize "the Spanish establishments on the Orinoco." This dispatch was a part of the archives of the British legation at Caracas for half a century, and it was not until 1887 that the then British minister, on being confronted with it, took the pains to disavow this act of his predecessor, on the ground that it was without the "knowledge or authority of the British Government." Indeed, about the time that Sir Robert dispatched his now famous note, there are various other acts which go to show that the agents of the British Government were unaccountably ignorant of what have since come to be "undoubted British rights" in Guiana.

In the latter part of the same year (1836) the British governor of Demerara, in a note printed among the Parliamentary papers, made the statement that the Pomaron River, west of the Essequibo and east of the Moroco, could be taken as the limit of the English colony. Further, in

September or October of 1840, an Englishman was arrested and tried for having killed an Indian. His counsel succeeded in showing that the crime had taken place in the territory of the Morocco, whereupon the British tribunal promptly acquitted him on the ground that it had no jurisdiction, the act having been committed in a foreign territory. Thus we see that in 1840 a British court in Demerara had judicial cognizance of the fact that the territory of the Morocco was Venezuelan territory and outside British jurisdiction. The governor of Guiana informed his government of these facts, in a dispatch dated 23d of August, 1841. It is not known that the British Government, either then or since, in any way disavowed these acts of its accredited agents.

Meanwhile the reports of the discovery of rich gold fields in the territory of the Yuruari reached London, and the English ministry soon began to display a lively concern in the boundary question. In 1841, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Robert Schomburgk, who was sent out first under the auspices of the Royal Geographical Society to explore the country in 1834, surveyed and laid out a line of demarcation. It does not appear that Venezuela was invited to coöperate in a work which affected her interests so vitally. The British consul, it is true, informed Venezuela of Schomburgk's mission, but the vigorous protest of the latter government went unheeded and ignored. Schomburgk continued his survey, and staked out the famous "Schomburgk line." This survey included the whole seaboard between the Essequibo and the Amacuro (which finds its outlet at the mouth of the Orinoco) and a vast section in the interior. One of its conspicuous features was the erection of a sentry box and the planting of a British flag at Point Barima at the mouth of the Orinoco.

The Venezuelans, not without a touch of humor, have uniformly contented themselves in all of their published maps by referring to this line as "capricious," and Schomburgk in his original map and report speaks of his line as the British claim, not boundary. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the British Government of that period took much the same view; for Lord Aberdeen, then prime minister, in reply to the urgent remonstrance of the Venezuelan minister at London, said, on the 11th of December, 1841, that the survey had been undertaken merely as a "preliminary step" to further discussion between the two governments, and not, as the Venezuelan Government seemed to fear, "with the intention of indicating dominion or empire on the part of Great Britain." He added that he was glad to learn that Venezuela had been able to ascertain that Point Barima had not been occupied by the British authorities. A few weeks later, on the 31st of January, 1842, Lord Aberdeen gave force and effect to this disclaimer by ordering the removal of all the marks set up by Schomburgk.

I have here certain letters which I ask leave to print with my remarks. I will not weary the Senate by reading them. The first one expresses the views of Lord Palmerston in 1840. Lord Palmerston therein suggests, for the consideration of Lord John Russell, that a map of British Guiana should be made out according to the boundaries described by Mr. Schomburgk; that the said map should be accompanied by a memoir, describing in detail the natural features which define and constitute the boundaries in question.

The same idea is very apparent in Schomburgk's report; in fact, he mentions in his memoir that he laid the line according to the natural boundaries of the terri-

tory as he conceived them. He was a botanist and an explorer.

The letter referred to is as follows:—

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 18, 1840.

SIR, — I am directed by Viscount Palmerston to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing copies and extracts of dispatches and their inclosures from Mr. Light, governor of British Guiana, relative to the expediency of an arrangement being made with the Brazilian, Venezuelan, and the Netherlands Governments by which the boundaries of British Guiana may be accurately defined.

With reference to that part of your letter in which you state that Lord John Russell considers it to be important that the boundaries of British Guiana should be ascertained and agreed upon, if possible, and that Mr. Schomburgk's researches in those parts have qualified him in a peculiar manner to be of use, should the service of any person acquainted with the geography of British Guiana be required for fixing the boundaries of the British territory, I am to state to you that the course of proceeding which Lord Palmerston would suggest for the consideration of Lord John Russell is that "a map of British Guiana should be made out according to the boundaries described by Mr. Schomburgk; that the said map should be accompanied by a memoir, describing in detail the natural features which define and constitute the boundaries in question, and that copies of that map and memoir should be delivered to the Governments of Venezuela, of Brazil, and of the Netherlands as a statement of the British claims; that in the meanwhile British commissioners should be sent to erect landmarks on the ground, in order to mark out by permanent erections the line of boundary so claimed by Great Britain." It would then rest with each of the three governments above mentioned to make any objection which they might have to bring forward against these boundaries, and to state the reasons upon which such objection might be founded, and Her Majesty's

Government would then give such answers thereto as might appear proper and just.

Lord Palmerston further considers that it would be expedient that the Brazilians should be required to withdraw from Pirara, and that the officer in command should be informed that any claim which Brazil may imagine itself to have to that village should be stated by the Brazilian Government to that of Great Britain, in order that it may be discussed and settled between the two governments.

I have, etc.,

LEVESON.

JAMES STEPHEN, Esq.

I have also a letter from Lord Aberdeen, dated the 31st of January, 1842, in which he speaks of removing the marks which had been put up, and explains that he is very glad to meet the wishes of the Venezuelan Government.

The letter referred to is as follows :—

FOREIGN OFFICE, January 31, 1842.

The undersigned, Her Majesty's principal secretary of state for foreign affairs, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note addressed to him on the 10th instant by Mr. Fortique, plenipotentiary of the Republic of Venezuela, representing the alarm and excitement which have been created in Venezuela on account of the marks fixed by Mr. Schomburgk at different points of his survey near the mouth of the Orinoco, and renewing his request that Her Majesty's Government will order the removal of these marks.

The undersigned begs to inform Mr. Fortique in reply that, in order to meet the wishes of the Government of Venezuela, Her Majesty's Government will send instructions to the governor of British Guiana directing him to remove the posts which have been placed by Mr. Schomburgk near the Orinoco.

But the undersigned feels it his duty distinctly to declare to Mr. Fortique that, although in order to put an end to the mis-

apprehension which appears to prevail in Venezuela with regard to the object of Mr. Schomburgk's survey the undersigned has consented to comply with the renewed representations of Mr. Fortique upon this affair, Her Majesty's Government must not be understood to abandon any portion of the rights of Great Britain over the territory which was formerly had by the Dutch in Guiana.

The undersigned begs to renew to Mr. Fortique the assurance of his high consideration.

ABERDEEN.

I have also another letter of Lord Aberdeen, written on March 30, 1844, in which he discusses first the British claim to all the territory as far as the Orinoco, but closes by saying that they will yield to Venezuela from the line of the Orinoco practically to the Pomaron. He says:—

Being convinced that the most important objects for the interest of Venezuela is the exclusive possession of the Orinoco, Her Majesty's Government is ready to yield to the Republic of Venezuela a portion of the coast sufficient to insure her the free control of the mouth of this her principal river and prevent its being under the control of any foreign power.

The letter referred to is as follows:—

[Extract from Lord Aberdeen's reply to Dr. Fortique.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, March 30, 1844.

In 1674 the West India Company, formed in 1627, was dissolved, but a new company was formed and authorized, restricting their rights to trade with certain parts of Africa, the Island of Curaçao, and the colonies of the Essequibo, and Boneverone (Pumaron), the latter extending, as above stated, as far as the Orinoco.

Pursuing the examination of the authorities, which in more modern times confirm these datas, it will be found that in the

"History of South America" by Bolt, published about the middle of the last century, Dutch Guiana is described as extending from the mouth of the Orinoco at 9° as far as the Marawaina to $6^{\circ} 20'$ latitude north; that in a map of said coast published in 1783 by Faden, the Orinoco River is established as the western limit of the Dutch, according to their pretensions; and that in a more recent chart published by Jeffery's in 1798, the Barima River is described as being the division between the Dutch and Spanish lands. The undersigned must declare that these authorities cannot be rejected, as being English, and therefore, having an interest in this question because, although at the date of the last cited chart the Dutch colony was under the protection of Great Britain, it was restored to the Batavian Republic in 1802, and there is no reason to doubt the testimony of Faden and Bolt, or to accuse them of partiality.

It is doubtful whether the same could be said of La Condamine, Bellin, and other French writers, whose government always showed itself to be jealous of the progress of the Dutch in the neighborhood of the settlement of Cayenne.

But, in reality, no doubt can exist that the mouth of the Orinoco was not only claimed by the Dutch as the western limit of their possessions, but also that from the very beginning they effected its military occupation and retained possession of it. Hartsinck says, "The first rivers found in Dutch Guiana coming from the Orinoco are the Barima, about one mile in width, where in olden times we had a fort." There exist documents of the West India Company showing that directors recommended to the commander of Pumarón to keep the Barima fort in good condition. Colonel Moody found the ruins of these fortifications when, in 1807, the English occupied the coast, and were preparing to send some forces to Angostura to destroy buccaneers that were pillaging the coast of Dutch Guiana, and also to fortify that place again. Mr. Schomburgk, when in the discharge of a commission, found the remains of the fort and also of cultivation in the neighboring territory.

The undersigned does not deem further evidence necessary to show how erroneous are the assertions of Señor Fortique when he states that the Essequibo has been considered as a dividing line between the two countries, and that territory lying between that river and the Orinoco has been considered by the world as belonging exclusively to Spain. These statements make the undersigned feel justified in doubting whether Señor Fortique would be supported by his own countrymen in his views, taking into consideration that in the maps of the provinces of Venezuela published four years ago by an officer of the Republic the extreme limits of the Venezuelan eastern claims is the Moroco River, and in truth, to judge from the exaggerated pretensions found in his work on other points, the author is not inclined to sin on the side of generosity with respect to the neighboring British colony.

Were the undersigned inclined to act on the spirit of Señor Fortique's communication, it is evident, by what he has said, that he ought to claim on behalf of Great Britain, as the rightful successor of Holland, all the coast from the Orinoco to the Essequibo; and such claim, aside from all questions of right, would certainly be much less injurious to Venezuela than the pretensions of Señor Fortique as to England, as Venezuela has no settlements on the disputed territory, and the admission or acknowledgment of the Essequibo as the limit of the Republic would, of course, mean that Great Britain should deliver about one half of the colony of Demerara, including Point Cartabo and the Island of Tkykoveral, where the Dutch founded their first settlement on the Majarini, the mission of Barlika Grove, and many settlements now existing on the Arabisi coast as far as fifty miles from the capital.

But the undersigned believes that the negotiations would not be free from difficulties if the claims that cannot be sustained are presented, and shall not, therefore, follow Señor Fortique's example; but state here the concessions that Great Britain is disposed to make of her rights, prompted by a friendly consid-

eration for Venezuela, and by her desire to avoid all cause of serious controversies between the two countries.

“Being convinced that the most important object for the interest of Venezuela is the exclusive possession of the Orinoco, Her Majesty’s Government is ready to yield to the Republic of Venezuela a portion of the coast sufficient to insure her the free control of the mouth of this her principal river and prevent its being under the control of any foreign power.” With this end in view, and being persuaded that a concession of the greatest importance has been made to Venezuela, Her Majesty’s Government is disposed to lay aside its rights upon the Amacuro as the western limit of the British territory, and to consider the mouth of the Guiana River as the boundary of Her Majesty’s possessions on the coast side. Moreover, Her Majesty’s Government will consent that the boundary in the interior be fixed by a line from the mouth of the Moroco, the point where the rivers Barama and Guiana meet, as far as the Aunama, whose upward course will be followed until the stream approaches the point nearest the Acarabisi; then following the downward course of the Acarabisi as far as its confluence with the Cuyuni, it will pursue the upward course of the latter as far as the highlands contiguous to the Boraima Mountains, where its waters are divided between the Essequibo and the river Branco.

Great Britain is then disposed to cede to Venezuela all the territory lying between the above-mentioned line and the Amacuro River and the chain of mountains where it has its head, upon condition that the Government of Venezuela shall engage itself not to alienate any portion of said territory to any foreign power, and also upon condition that the tribe of Indians now living in said territory shall be protected against all ill-treatment and oppression.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Señor Fortique the assurance of the highest consideration.

ABERDEEN.

Mr. President, we are told now that Great Britain will not consider any question arising to the east of the Schomburgk line, which terminates at Point Barima at the mouth of the Orinoco. At that time Lord Aberdeen, as may be seen in his letter, considered the Orinoco of vital importance to Venezuela. He was ready to withdraw all their claims, whether they were large or small, to the land in that neighborhood and west of the Moroco practically, in order that Venezuela might control that great stream.

MR. MORGAN. Mr. President —

THE VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Alabama?

MR. LODGE. Certainly.

MR. MORGAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he is quite sure that the first exploration made by Schomburgk was under the auspices of the Geographical Society, or whether he did not go out from the United States, where he was occupying the position of clerk in a tobacco store in New York, — being a botanist and otherwise interested in natural objects, — upon a private exploration. After he made the exploration he made his report to the Geographical Society, whereupon they gave him authority to make it more definite, and after that the Government of Great Britain took up the subject.

MR. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that Schomburgk, as he states, was in business in this country, a clerk in a shop. He went to an island, some West Indian island or an island in the neighborhood of South America, of which he made a survey and a map. He sent it to the Geographical Society at London. It was so very well done that the society invited him to make explorations on the mainland. In 1834 he went to Guiana under their auspices. It is so stated in the Parlia-

mentary paper which prints extracts from his letters. He went there in 1834 and explored Guiana, and made a report and wrote a memoir. In that expedition he practically laid down the line as he thought it ought to be. Then the British Government, hearing of this memoir, ordered those portions of it printed which related to the boundary, and they sent him out officially in 1840 to mark out the boundary, which I think it is apparent he had really already surveyed. The Parliamentary paper containing the report or the extracts from his memoir (it is a very rare one; I have never seen more than one copy of it) states in a note that those are extracts from his letters and memoir, and in those he constantly refers to the natural boundaries. He devotes most of his space to discussing the boundary of Brazil on the south, where the serious trouble then was. He devotes very little space, comparatively speaking, to the question of the Venezuelan boundary. He then went out in 1840, as I have said, and officially ran the line which bears his name. He returned to London in 1844, when he was knighted for his services, and, I believe, subsequently came to South America as a British consul.

MR. DAVIS. Did he only lay down one line?

MR. LODGE. I think so, although I am not sure. There is what is called an extension of the Schomburgk line, but I think Schomburgk himself laid only one line, although he may have changed his first boundary.

A few weeks later, the marks of which I have spoken were removed. In other words, the British Government of that day disavowed the Schomburgk line, within which we are now told Great Britain cannot assent to arbitration. It required half a century, however, to bring into clearer relief just what really was intended in referring to

the Schomburgk line as a mere "preliminary step" to future negotiations. Lord Aberdeen abandoned the Schomburgk line in 1841. In 1890 Lord Salisbury, then Prime Minister, repudiated the act of his predecessor, Lord Aberdeen. This is what he said in a note on the 10th of February to the Venezuelan minister of foreign affairs:—

Her Majesty's Government cannot accept as satisfactory any arrangement not admitting as English property the territory included within the line laid down by Sir R. Schomburgk.

We can see in this way how that line, from being the mere suggestion of an explorer, based on natural features, has now become an immutable right about which discussion is out of the question.

Popular feeling in Venezuela had been greatly excited by the events connected with the Schomburgk incident. It was in response to repeated instructions from Caracas that the Venezuelan minister in London finally succeeded in opening negotiations. The attempt was abortive in any immediate results. The Venezuelan Government proposed the Essequibo as a frontier, and based its argument upon the ancient maps and treaties. In response Lord Aberdeen proposed the Moroco. This proposition would probably have been accepted as a compromise had it not been accompanied by some offensive and humiliating conditions which forced Venezuela to reject it. Instructions, however, were issued to Señor Fortique, the Venezuelan minister, to suggest suitable modifications; but his sudden death virtually suspended further negotiation for a period of thirty years.

Occasional notes were, however, interchanged, and of these quite the most significant was one addressed by

Belfard Hinton Wilson, the British charge d'affaires at Caracas, on November 18, 1850, to the Venezuelan minister of foreign affairs. Mr. Wilson, it appears, had become somewhat alarmed "in relation to the existence of a propaganda to mislead and excite public opinion concerning the boundary question." He therefore took this opportunity of saying (I quote from his published letter): —

The Venezuelan Government, in justice to Great Britain, cannot mistrust for a moment the sincerity of the formal declaration which is now made in the name and by the express order of Her Majesty's Government, that Great Britain has no intention to occupy or encroach upon the territory in dispute.

The territory in dispute lies between the Orinoco and the Essequibo; most of it between the Schomburgk line and the Essequibo. It was the territory in dispute, according to the authentic utterance of Her Majesty's Government in 1850, and now it is territory which must not even be discussed. A similar assurance from Venezuela was asked for and promptly given. This was, of course, pending the settlement of the boundary question.

It was not until 1876 that negotiations were again opened, the initiative being taken, as usual, by Venezuela. Dr. José Maria Rojas was sent to London as minister resident, with explicit instructions to terminate the dispute, if possible, in a way honorable to Venezuela. Intimation was conveyed to the British foreign office, in accordance with the spirit of these instructions, that a line of compromise rather than one of strict right would be considered, so anxious was Venezuela to bring about a final settlement. After several years of unremitting endeavor, Dr. Rojas was at length rewarded by receiving from Lord Salisbury, on the 10th of January, 1880, a

statement "of the claim of Her Majesty's Government by virtue of ancient treaties with the native tribes." This revised line of demarcation was found to include not only the old Schomburgk line but a vast and valuable tract beyond it. Lord Salisbury promised, in conclusion, to consider in the "most friendly spirit" any proposition which the Government of Venezuela might see fit to make for the establishment of a limit satisfactory to both nations. The reference to ancient treaties with the native Indian tribes was justly regarded by Venezuela as being involved in a good deal of obscurity. The claim, which was now set up for the first time, was certainly a novel one. The particular treaties and the particular tribes referred to were known to Great Britain alone. Likewise the manner in which these tribes came to be recognized as free and independent, possessed of the attributes of sovereignty, was another diplomatic secret, which was safely guarded within the precincts of the British foreign office. As a matter of fact, the Indians had been for centuries subjects of Spain and Holland, and had long since lost all right to make a treaty with any one.

In accordance with Lord Salisbury's suggestion that Venezuela submit some proposition "for the establishment of a limit satisfactory to both nations," Dr. Rojas proposed the Morocco, Lord Aberdeen's old divisional line; but shortly afterwards the Beaconsfield ministry fell and Lord Granville became minister of foreign affairs. In a note dated September 15, 1881, Lord Granville declined to accept the Morocco as a boundary, but suggested a line which should begin at a place on the seacoast at a longitude of twenty-nine miles to the east of the right shore of the river Barima. This proposition was in turn rejected by Venezuela. A few years later a final adjustment of all

difficulties between the two countries seemed at length to be in sight. The British Government consented to unite the boundary question with the question of additional duty on merchandise coming from the Antilles and certain indemnity demands made by British citizens against Venezuela. It was proposed to pave the way to an adjustment of all issues and controversies by one treaty. "The proposal to settle by arbitration questions which may arise between the countries," wrote Lord Granville to General Guzman Blanco, on the 15th of April, 1885, "meets with the entire concurrence of Her Majesty's Government." An actual convention was drawn up, but before it could be signed the ministry changed. Lord Salisbury, who resumed the foreign portfolio, expressly repudiated the arbitration agreement made by his predecessor, and the negotiations abruptly ended. According to Lord Salisbury, to refer all disputes and controversies to arbitration "would be without precedent in the treaties made by Great Britain." The next attempt to reopen the question came in the following year, when the Venezuela legation renewed its efforts to secure some satisfactory compromise, and suggested arbitration as the means. Lord Rosebery, in July, 1886, replied by proposing a frontier which would include the river Guiana in British Guiana. Coupled to this memorandum was a demand for the free navigation of the Orinoco, which made it impossible.

Meantime the British aggressions in the disputed zone, the region which Great Britain had solemnly promised not to occupy while in dispute, began to be more and more aggravated. Beginning with October, 1884, various marks of British sovereignty were repeatedly set up or posted. Fortifications were thrown up at Barima Point. The Venezuelan commissary at the mouth of the Amacuro was

arrested and tried for the alleged ill-treatment of a Portuguese subject. Venezuela protested that the status quo of 1850, not to occupy the territory in dispute, was being flagrantly violated. No heed was paid to this remonstrance. There was under such circumstances but one honorable course for Venezuela to pursue. She broke off diplomatic relations with Great Britain on the 20th of February, 1887. Even this, however, did not terminate the efforts of Venezuela to arrive at some understanding with her powerful adversary. She has since made several futile endeavors to refer the whole question to friendly arbitration. The last one was made as late as the spring of 1893, by Dr. Michelena, the confidential agent of Venezuela at London. It went the way of all the others. Lord Rosebery, in 1893, was plainly convinced that his demands of 1886 were too moderate; he reinforced them by conditions more objectionable than ever. In 1850 Great Britain herself suggested non-intervention in the disputed belt; in 1893 it was quite impossible for England to consent to arbitrate the greater part of this identical territory which had for so many years constituted "an integral portion of British Guiana."

MR. HILL. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me for just a moment?

MR. LODGE. Certainly.

MR. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts seems to have given the subject great consideration, and I desire to ask him if he can inform the Senate whether Venezuela has ever at any time refused to submit the matter to arbitration.

MR. LODGE. Never.

MR. HILL. I asked the question because of a published interview said to have been given out by Mr. Lincoln, in

which it was stated that at one period Venezuela had refused arbitration.

MR. LODGE. I have never met with any instance in which she refused arbitration by itself. So far as I am aware, — and I think I have examined all the correspondence, — she has sought arbitration constantly. She has rejected some of the compromises offered by Great Britain in which arbitration may have been a feature, but on other grounds. She rejected, for example, one compromise offered by Great Britain, because Great Britain insisted upon the free navigation of the Orinoco. But I do not think that Venezuela has ever rejected arbitration as an independent proposition. On the contrary, she has always sought it.

It will be observed, from the brief outline of the dispute which I have given, that no new rights have come to England or to Venezuela since 1814, that is, since the declaration of President Monroe. They have the rights of Spain and Holland, respectively, — nothing more and nothing less, — and are entitled to exactly what those inherited rights give them. In 1836 a British minister acknowledged that Point Barima belonged to Venezuela by asking the Venezuelan Government to erect a lighthouse there. In 1840 a British court in Demerara declared the territory of the Moroco, far to the east of the Orinoco, to be Venezuelan territory. In 1841 an English explorer laid out a perfectly arbitrary line running from the mouth of the Orinoco in a southerly direction until it reached the southern boundary of British Guiana. Lord Aberdeen disavowed this line, and proposed another starting at the river Moroco and going farther into the interior; Lord Granville proposed another reaching farther to the west; Lord Rosebery another inside the Schomburgk line, but coupled with the

free navigation of the Orinoco. In 1893 he proposed a second line, and meantime Lord Salisbury had extended the British claim while he was secretary for foreign affairs. The Statesman's Year Book will show, if any one cares to examine it, that the British claim upon Venezuela advanced in one year thirty-three thousand square miles. Every British minister has offered a different line within which Great Britain would not consent to arbitrate, and every British minister has gone beyond his predecessor in making fresh claims to territory beyond the line which he offered and about which he would arbitrate. At first sight this seems to denote inconsistency on the part of the British Government, but in reality their course has been just the reverse. There is apparently just as much support for one line as another when they pass beyond the valley of the Essequibo. From Schomburgk down, every line was entirely arbitrary, and the constantly growing claims beyond the various lines offered was in entire keeping with the policy of the British Government. Their object was to get as much new territory as they could if the matter ever came to a settlement, which they have used every artifice to delay.

I do not personally believe that Great Britain has a good claim to a foot of land beyond the Essequibo; for Indian treaties are altogether too flimsy to support any serious contention, and the claim of recent settlement is impossible, as that would entitle England to any vacant land anywhere in North or South America on which a British subject had settled.

MR. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether in his researches he has discovered any trace of the Indian treaties alluded to by Lord Salisbury?

MR. LODGE. I have not. They must be concealed in the British case.

But it is not my purpose to pass upon the merits of either the British or the Venezuelan claim. All I have desired to show, and all that it is necessary to show, is that there is a dispute as to the ownership of the territory lying west of the Essequibo, and that neither England nor Venezuela holds an uncontested title to any portion of it. That disputed territory either belonged to Holland or it did not. If it did, England ought to have it, and there would not be the slightest disposition on the part of the United States to interfere with her possession of it. If it did not, it belongs to Venezuela, and Venezuela ought to have it. The question is one for the arbitration of an impartial tribunal, and by the decision of such a tribunal the United States would cheerfully abide. But if England, with no authority but a disputed claim, seizes territory and declines arbitration upon it, her action does not differ from seizing and holding new territory in the Americas by the right of conquest. The boundary dispute does not touch the essence of the question, which is the acquisition of new territory in this hemisphere by a European power. Such pretexts can always be found. If England can seize territory under a claim which has grown larger with each succeeding year, there is nothing to prevent her taking indefinite regions in South America. If England can do it, and is allowed to do it, by the United States, every other European power can do the same, and they will not be slow to follow England's example. We have seen them parcel out Africa, and if we do not interpose now in this case the fate of large portions of South America will be the same. We shall have formidable rivals all about us; we shall be in constant danger of

war; and we shall be forced to become a military power with great armies and navies.

The seizure of this South American territory by England is an absolute violation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is so in the most literal sense, because Mr. Monroe declared that the Americas were no longer subject to European colonization, and there is no difference in principle between settling a new colony, and under pretext of a boundary dispute extending indefinitely and unlawfully and by force the bounds of an old colony. It also violates the doctrine, because it oppresses an American state, against which Mr. Monroe specifically declared. But the principle stands on broader grounds than these. I have heard it said that no one knows what the Monroe Doctrine is. Mr. President, it is as simple in principle as the Declaration of Independence, to which Jefferson compared it. It is not a doctrine of international law, and the attempt to discuss it or to oppose it on that ground is a waste of words. Like the independence of this country, it is a question of fact and not of law. The independence of this country is unquestioned, because, having declared it, we have compelled the world to recognize it. In the same way we have always acted on the declaration of Mr. Monroe as the guiding principle of our foreign policy. We shall now, I hope, declare it again, with the formal sanction of Congress representing the people of the United States. It is idle to argue either for or against it as a matter of international law, for it requires no such support. We stand by the Monroe Doctrine for the same reason that England upholds Afghanistan, and takes the Shan States from China, because it is essential to our safety and our defense. The Monroe Doctrine rests primarily on the great law of self-preservation.

We declare the Monroe Doctrine to be a principle which we believe essential to the honor, the safety, the interests of the United States. We declare it as a statement of fact, and we must have it recognized as our independence and national existence are recognized by all the world. It must be recognized, because we sustain and support it; and we can no more permit it to be a matter of discussion with other nations than we can afford to discuss with them our national welfare or our forms of government. It embodies for us the same principle as the balance of power so jealously maintained by the nations of Europe. They will not allow that to be disturbed, and we hold to our balance of power with equal tenacity.

The Monroe Doctrine interferes in no wise with the rights which the principles of international law give to all nations. It does not touch the question of reparation for injuries inflicted upon the subjects of any European power by any of the Central or South American states. We cherish that right jealously ourselves; we do not deny it to others. If the subjects of any European power suffer wrong at the hands of any of the governments of South or Central America, that power is entitled to demand the fullest satisfaction and redress. But, Mr. President, the question of reparation must not be mixed up with the acquisition of territory. Lord Salisbury, with the ingenuity for which he is distinguished, has made a claim for reparation upon Venezuela on account of the arrest by the Venezuelan authorities of certain British subjects. He turns to us and to the rest of the world with the inquiry as to whether the Monroe Doctrine is to interfere with the right of every power to protect its citizens in South America. To such a question there can be but one answer, and Lord Salisbury is assured beforehand of the sympathy

of all nations on that point. But the whole case has not been stated in that question. Those British subjects were arrested on the disputed territory, on the land which the British Government, by its accredited representative, solemnly pledged itself not to occupy until the question of ownership was finally settled. If that territory belongs to England, those men were wrongfully arrested. If it belongs to Venezuela, they were rightfully arrested. If Venezuela pays now the indemnity fixed and demanded by England, and admits in terms that she does so because these men, being on British territory, were wrongfully arrested, she weakens her whole case. The Monroe Doctrine does not interfere with any nation seeking reparation for injuries to its subjects, but it does interfere if a demand for reparation is to be made the pretext for the seizure of territory by a European power on the American continent.

The Monroe Doctrine, as I have said, is very simple. It is merely the declaration that no foreign power must establish a new government, acquire new territory by purchase or force or by any method whatever, or seek to control existing governments in the Americas. That is the principle which Mr. Monroe declared. If there is any dispute as to the meaning of his language, it is not needful to dwell upon it. That is what the American people believed he meant. That is the way American statesmen have interpreted it; and that there may be no future misunderstanding, that is what we should declare it to be, and to have always been, by this resolution.

Mr. President, we have neglected too long our foreign policy, and the great interests of the United States which lie beyond her borders. We have permitted this English advance upon Venezuelan territory to go unchecked for

years. The time has now come to end this state of things. We want this matter settled, and settled by arbitration; because if it is settled otherwise it is a blow to a principle vital to the welfare and the dignity of the United States. But, Mr. President, there is more in it than this. If we neglect our foreign affairs, England does not neglect hers. At the last session of Congress I called the attention of the Senate and of the country to the manner in which England had absorbed the islands of the Pacific, and to the necessity of our controlling the Hawaiian Islands, a necessity which becomes more pressing with each succeeding day. I ask you now to look at the Caribbean Sea. I ask you to note the strong naval station which England has established at Santa Lucia. Follow a line thence to the westward, and you find Trinidad, the development of which has been strongly pushed of late years, then Jamaica, and finally British Honduras. That line faces the South American coast. This territory claimed from Venezuela is being pushed steadily to the westward along that coast, and the point at which it aims is the control of the mouths of the Orinoco, one of the great river systems of South America. The purpose of all these movements is written plainly on the map. If successful they will give Great Britain control of the Orinoco and of the Spanish Main, and will make the Caribbean Sea little better than a British lake.

We are a great nation, Mr. President, and we have a great nation's duties and responsibilities. The path which we should follow lies clear before us. We must be the leaders in the Western Hemisphere. We must protect our coasts and hold the commerce of that hemisphere. We do not meddle with the affairs of Europe. Neither Great Britain nor Europe must be permitted to interfere

with our affairs or gain new territory here. We seek no quarrels with any nation. We have not been the aggressors in any of the difficulties which are now lowering upon the horizon. But, Mr. President, I think there is no mistaking the temper of the American people. For thirty years they have been absorbed in healing the ravages of civil war and in completing the conquest of the great continent which was our inheritance. That work is done. The American people have begun to turn their eyes toward those interests of the United States which lie beyond our borders and yet so near our doors. They see those interests have been neglected. They see another nation hemming them in with fortifications and encroaching upon regions which must remain what they have always been — American. They are resolved that there shall be an end to these encroachments. They are resolved that the United States shall not sink in the scale of nations; that it shall not be menaced even by that nation to whom we are united by the bonds of blood and speech; but that it shall fulfill abroad, as at home, the great destiny to which it has been called. The American people, in my judgment, believe in and cherish the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and will not suffer them to be infringed.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that the people of England have the least desire to engage in hostilities with the United States, any more than we seek or desire hostilities with them. Nor do I think that they take any serious interest in this disputed Venezuelan territory, or realize even now that the question involves for us a principle which we consider vital to our safety and our welfare. We have no desire to interfere with any rightful possession of Great Britain in South America; but we cannot

allow her to set up doubtful claims to American territory, and then seize and hold that territory by force. If she can do it successfully in Venezuela, she can do it in Mexico or Cuba ; if she can do it, other nations can also. We do not ask her to give up her rightful territory or retreat an inch. All we ask is that she shall submit this disputed boundary to the arbitration of an impartial tribunal. We have nothing to gain ourselves by the decision of that tribunal, but in the reference to arbitration there is involved a principle which we regard as vital. We cannot believe that any English ministry seriously intends to force hostilities on the United States, and yet their recent policy is, to say the least, unfortunate. We have seen British forces at Corinto. We know the attitude the English Government assumes in Venezuela. They are attempting to take land on the Alaskan boundary. They have just denounced the *modus vivendi*, and reopened in that way the perilous dispute of the northeastern fisheries. It is not by accident that these events have all occurred or all come to an acute stage within the past year. They are not due to us, for we have committed no aggression upon anybody. Of all these difficulties which are upon us, the most immediate is that involved in the dispute with Venezuela. They tell us that this territory is remote and worthless. It is remote, perhaps, but it is not worthless ; for if it had been, the Venezuelan possession of it would be undisturbed. But it matters not whether it is worthless or valuable. The tea tax was trivial, but our forefathers refused to pay it because it involved a great principle, and the attempt to collect it cost Great Britain her North American colonies. The American people believe to-day just as firmly in the principle of the Monroe Doctrine. They deem it essential to their honor, their

safety, and their interests as a nation, and they are prepared to defend it when it is assailed.

Mr. President, who is responsible for the unhappily strained relations between England and the United States? As I have pointed out, we have not been the aggressors on any of the points now in dispute, whether in Alaska or Venezuela. What, then, has strained our relations? Is it not the peremptory refusal to arbitrate this question of boundary? Who gave that refusal? Great Britain. We have appointed a commission, not to arbitrate between Great Britain and Venezuela, but to inform us, after careful investigation, what the true divisional line, in their opinion, should be. Who has drawn an arbitrary line of boundary and declared that they would not arbitrate to the east of it? Not the United States, but Great Britain. Ultimatums are what strain relations, and they have come from Great Britain and not from us. I believe that this question will be peacefully settled by the good sense of the representatives of England and the United States; but I am very clear that such settlement can only be reached by action on the part of Congress and of the President, which shall be as firm as it is temperate, and which shall maintain the Monroe Doctrine absolutely and at all hazards wherever it justly applies. That doctrine is as important to us as the balance of power is to Europe; and those who maintain the latter must not attempt to break down the principle which guards the integrity of the Americas, and protects them from the interference and control of foreign powers.

THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, MARCH 16, 1896.

THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

MR. PRESIDENT: This bill is intended to amend the existing law so as to restrict still further immigration to the United States. Paupers, diseased persons, convicts, and contract laborers are now excluded. By this bill it is proposed to make a new class of excluded immigrants, and add to those which have just been named the totally ignorant. The bill is of the simplest kind. The first section excludes from the country all immigrants who cannot read and write either their own or some other language. The second section merely provides a simple test for determining whether the immigrant can read or write, and is added to the bill so as to define the duties of the immigrant inspectors, and to assure to all immigrants alike perfect justice and a fair test of their knowledge.

Two questions arise in connection with this bill. The first is as to the merits of this particular form of restriction; the second as to the general policy of restricting immigration at all. I desire to discuss briefly these two questions in the order in which I have stated them. The smaller question as to the merits of this particular bill comes first. The existing laws of the United States now exclude, as I have said, certain classes of immigrants who, it is universally agreed, would be most undesirable additions to our population. These exclusions have been enforced, and the results have been beneficial; but the ex-

cluded classes are extremely limited and do not by any means cover all or even any considerable part of the immigrants whose presence here is undesirable or injurious, nor do they have any adequate effect in properly reducing the great body of immigration to this country. There can be no doubt that there is a very earnest desire on the part of the American people to restrict further, and much more extensively than has yet been done, foreign immigration to the United States. The question before the committee was how this could best be done; that is, by what method the largest number of undesirable immigrants and the smallest possible number of desirable immigrants could be shut out. Three methods of obtaining this further restriction have been widely discussed of late years, and in various forms have been brought to the attention of Congress. The first was the imposition of a capitation tax on all immigrants. There can be no doubt as to the effectiveness of this method if the tax is made sufficiently heavy. But although exclusion by a tax would be thorough, it would be indiscriminating, and your committee did not feel that the time had yet come for its application. The second scheme was to restrict immigration by requiring consular certification of immigrants. This plan has been much advocated, and if it were possible to carry it out thoroughly and to add very largely to the number of our consuls in order to do so, it would no doubt be effective and beneficial. But the committee was satisfied that consular certification was, under existing circumstances, impractical; that the necessary machinery could not be provided; that it would lead to many serious questions with foreign governments; that it could not be properly and justly enforced; and that it would take a long time to put it in operation. It is not

necessary to go further into the details which brought the committee to this conclusion. It is sufficient to say here that the opinion of the committee is shared, they believe, by all expert judges who have given the most careful attention to the question.

The third method was to exclude all immigrants who could neither read nor write, and this is the plan which was adopted by the committee and which is embodied in this bill. In their report the committee have shown by statistics, which have been collected and tabulated with great care, the emigrants who would be affected by this illiteracy test. It is not necessary for me here to do more than summarize the results of the committee's investigation, which have been set forth fully in their report. It is found, in the first place, that the illiteracy test will bear most heavily upon the Italians, Russians, Poles, Hungarians, Greeks, and Asiatics, and very lightly, or not at all, upon English-speaking emigrants, or Germans, Scandinavians, and French. In other words, the races most affected by the illiteracy test are those whose emigration to this country has begun within the last twenty years and swelled rapidly to enormous proportions, races with which the English-speaking people have never hitherto assimilated, and who are most alien to the great body of the people of the United States. On the other hand, immigrants from the United Kingdom and of those races which are most closely related to the English-speaking people, and who with the English-speaking people themselves founded the American colonies and built up the United States, are affected but little by the proposed test. These races would not be prevented by this law from coming to this country in practically undiminished numbers. These kindred races also are those who alone

go to the Western and Southern States, where immigrants are desired, and take up our unoccupied lands. The races which would suffer most seriously by exclusion under the proposed bill furnish the immigrants who do not go to the West or South, where immigration is needed, but who remain on the Atlantic seaboard, where immigration is not needed and where their presence is most injurious and undesirable.

The statistics prepared by the committee show further that the immigrants excluded by the illiteracy test are those who remain for the most part in congested masses in our great cities. They furnish, as other tables show, a large proportion of the population of the slums. The committee's report proves that illiteracy runs parallel with the slum population, with criminals, paupers, and juvenile delinquents of foreign birth or parentage, whose percentage is out of all proportion to their share of the total population when compared with the percentage of the same classes among the native born. It also appears from investigations which have been made that the immigrants who would be shut out by the illiteracy test are those who bring least money to the country and come most quickly upon private or public charity for support. The replies of the governors of twenty-six states to the Immigration Restriction League show that in only two cases are immigrants of the classes affected by the illiteracy test desired, and those are of a single race. All the other immigrants mentioned by the governors as desirable belong to the races which are but slightly affected by the provisions of this bill. It is also proved that the classes now excluded by law—the criminals, the diseased, the paupers, and the contract laborers—are furnished chiefly by the same races as those most affected by the test of illiteracy. The same

is true as to those immigrants who come to this country for a brief season and return to their native land, taking with them the money they have earned in the United States. There is no more hurtful and undesirable class of immigrants from every point of view than these "birds of passage," and the tables show that the races furnishing the largest number of "birds of passage" have also the greatest proportion of illiterates.

These facts prove to demonstration that the exclusion of immigrants unable to read or write, as proposed by this bill, will operate against the most undesirable and harmful part of our present immigration, and shut out elements which no thoughtful or patriotic man can wish to see multiplied among the people of the United States. The report of the committee also proves that this bill meets the great requirement of all legislation of this character, in excluding the greatest proportion possible of thoroughly undesirable and dangerous immigrants and the smallest proportion of immigrants who are unobjectionable.

I have said enough to show what the effects of this bill would be, and that if enacted into law it would be fair in its operation and highly beneficial in its results. It now remains for me to discuss the second and larger question, as to the advisability of restricting immigration at all. This is a subject of the greatest magnitude and the most far-reaching importance. It has two sides, the economic and the social. As to the former, but few words are necessary. There is no one thing which does so much to bring about a reduction of wages and to injure the American wage earner as the unlimited introduction of cheap foreign labor through unrestricted immigration. Statistics show that the change in the race character of our immigration has been accompanied by a corresponding de-

cline in its quality. The number of skilled mechanics and of the persons trained to some occupation or pursuit has fallen off, while the number of those without occupation or training, that is, who are totally unskilled, has risen in our recent immigration to enormous proportions. This low, unskilled labor is the most deadly enemy of the American wage earner, and does more than anything else toward lowering his wages and forcing down his standard of living. An attempt was made, with the general assent of both political parties, to meet this crying evil some years ago by the passage of what are known as the contract-labor laws. That legislation was excellent in intention, but has proved of but little value in practice. It has checked to a certain extent the introduction of cheap, low-class labor in large masses into the United States. It has made it a little more difficult for such labor to come here; but the labor of this class continues to come, even if not in the same way, and the total amount of it has not been materially reduced. Even if the contract-labor laws were enforced intelligently and thoroughly, there is no reason to suppose that they would have any adequate effect in checking the evil which they were designed to stop. It is perfectly clear, after the experience of several years, that the only relief which can come to the American wage earner from the competition of low-class immigrant labor must be by general laws restricting the total amount of immigration, and framed in such a way as to affect most strongly those elements of the immigration which furnish the low, unskilled, and ignorant foreign labor.

It is not necessary to enter further into a discussion of the economic side of the general policy of restricting immigration. In this direction the argument is unanswerable. If we have any regard for the welfare, the wages,

or the standard of life of American workingmen, we should take immediate steps to restrict foreign immigration. There is no danger, at present at all events, to our workingmen from the coming of skilled mechanics or trained and educated men with a settled occupation or pursuit, for immigrants of this class will never seek to lower the American standard of life and wages. On the contrary, they desire the same standard for themselves. But there is an appalling danger to the American wage earner from the flood of low, unskilled, ignorant, foreign labor which has poured into the country for some years past, and which not only takes lower wages, but accepts a standard of life and living so low that the American workingman cannot compete with it.

I now come to the aspect of this question which is graver and more serious than any other. The injury of unrestricted immigration to American wages and American standards of living is sufficiently plain and is bad enough, but the danger which this immigration threatens to the quality of our citizenship is far worse. That which it concerns us to know, and that which is more vital to us as a people than all possible questions of tariff or currency, is whether the quality of our citizenship is endangered by the present course and character of immigration to the United States. To determine this question we must look into the history of our race.

Two hundred years ago Daniel Defoe, in some very famous verses called the "True-born Englishman," defended William III, the greatest ruler, with the exception of Cromwell, whom England has had since the days of the Plantagenets, against the accusation so constantly made at the time that he was a foreigner. The line taken by Defoe is the highly characteristic one of a fierce at-

tack upon his opponents. He declared, in lines which were as forcible as they were rough, that the English-speaking people drew their descent from many sources; that there was no such thing as a pure-blooded Englishman; and that King William was as much an Englishman as any of them. The last proposition, in regard to the King, whose mother was a Stuart, was undoubtedly true. It was also superficially true that Englishmen drew their blood from many strains; but the rest of the argument was ludicrously false if the matter is considered in the light of modern history and modern science.

For practical purposes in considering the question of race and in dealing with the civilized peoples of western Europe and of America, there is no such thing as a race of original purity according to the divisions of ethnical science. In considering the practical problems of the present time we can deal only with artificial races, — that is, races like the English-speaking people, the French, or the Germans, — who have been developed as races by the operation during a long period of time of climatic influences, wars, migrations, conquests, and industrial development. To the philologist and the ethnologist it is of great importance to determine the ethnical divisions of mankind in the earliest historic times. To the scientific modern historian, to the student of social phenomena, and to the statesman alike, the early ethnic divisions are of little consequence; but the sharply marked race divisions which have been gradually developed by the conditions and events of the last thousand years are absolutely vital. It is by these conditions and events that the races or nations which to-day govern the world have been produced, and it is their characteristics which it is important for us to understand.

How, then, has the English-speaking race, which to-day controls so large a part of the earth's surface, been formed? Great Britain and Ireland at the time of the Roman conquest were populated by Celtic tribes. After the downfall of the Roman Empire these tribes remained in possession of the islands, with probably but very slight infusion of Latin blood. Then came what is commonly known as the Saxon invasion. Certain North German tribes, own brothers to those other tribes which swept southward and westward over the whole Roman Empire, crossed the English Channel and landed in the corner of England known as the Isle of Thanet. They were hard fighters, pagans, and adventurers. They swept over the whole of England and the Lowlands of Scotland. A few British words like *basket*, relating to domestic employments, indicate that only women of the conquered race, and not many of those, were spared. The extermination was fierce and thorough. The native Celts were driven back into the Highlands of Scotland and to the edge of the sea in Cornwall and Wales, while all the rest of the land became Saxon.

The conquerors established themselves in their new country, were converted to Christianity, and began to advance in civilization. Then came a fresh wave from the Germanic tribes. This time it was the Danes. They were of the same blood as the Saxons, and the two kindred races fought hard for the possession of England, until the last comers prevailed and their chiefs reached the throne. Then in 1066 there was another invasion, this time from the shores of France. But the new invaders and conquerors were not Frenchmen. As Carlyle says, they were only Saxons who spoke French. A hundred years before, these Normans, or Northmen, northernmost of all the Ger-

manic tribes, had descended from their land of snow and ice upon Europe. They were the most remarkable of all the people who poured out of the Germanic forests. They came upon Europe in their long, low ships, a set of fighting pirates and buccaneers; and yet these same pirates brought with them out of the darkness and cold of the north a remarkable literature and a strange and poetic mythology. Wherever they went they conquered, and wherever they stopped they set up for themselves dukedoms, principalities, and kingdoms. To them we owe the marvels of Gothic architecture, for it was they who were the great builders and architects of mediæval Europe. They were great military engineers as well, and revived the art of fortified defense, which had been lost to the world. They were great statesmen and great generals, and they had only been in Normandy about a hundred years when they crossed the English Channel, conquered the country, and gave to England for many generations to come her kings and nobles. But the Normans in their turn were absorbed or blended with the great mass of the Danes and the still earlier Saxons. In reality, they were all one people. They had different names and spoke differing dialects, but their blood and their characteristics were the same. And so this Germanic people of one blood, coming through various channels, dwelt in England, assimilating more or less and absorbing to a greater or less degree their neighbors of the northern and western Celtic fringe, with an occasional fresh infusion from their own brethren who dwelt in the low sea-girt lands at the mouths of the Scheldt and Rhine. In the course of the centuries these people were welded together and had made a new speech and a new race, with strong and well-defined qualities, both mental and moral.

When the Reformation came this work was pretty nearly done ; and after that great movement had struck off the shackles from the human mind, the English-speaking people were ready to come forward and begin to play their part in a world where the despotism of the church had been broken, and where political despotism was about to enter on its great struggle against the forces of freedom. Let me describe what these English people were at the close of the sixteenth century, when the work of race making had been all done and the achievements of the race so made were about to begin. I will take for this purpose, not words of my own, but the brilliant sentences of one of the greatest of modern English writers : —

In those past silent centuries, among those silent classes, much had been going on. Not only had red deer in the New and other forests been got preserved, and shot ; and treacheries of Simon de Montfort, wars of Red and White Roses, battles of Crecy, battles of Bosworth, and many other battles been got transacted, and adjusted ; but England wholly, not without sore toil and aching bones to the millions of sires and the millions of sons these eighteen generations, had been got drained, and tilled, covered with yellow harvests, beautiful and rich possessions ; the mud-wooden Ceasters and Chesters had become steepled, tile-roofed, compact towns. Sheffield had taken to the manufacture of Sheffield whittles ; Worstead could from wool spin yarn, and knit or weave the same into stockings or breeches for men. England had property valuable to the auctioneer ; but the accumulate manufacturing, commercial, economic skill which lay impalpably warehoused in English hands and heads, what auctioneer could estimate ?

Hardly an Englishman to be met with but could do something — some cunninger thing than break his fellow-creature's head with battle-axes. The seven incorporated trades, with their million guild brethren, with their hammers, their shuttles, and

tools ; what an army — fit to conquer that land of England, as we say, and to hold it conquered. Nay, strangest of all, the English people had acquired the faculty and habit of thinking, even of believing ; individual conscience had unfolded itself among them ; conscience, and intelligence its handmaid. Ideas of innumerable kinds were circulating among these men ; witness one Shakespeare, a wool-comber, poacher, or whatever else, at Stratford, in Warwickshire, who happened to write books — the finest human figure, as I apprehend, that nature has hitherto seen fit to make of our widely diffused Teutonic clay. Saxon, Norman, Celt, or Sarmat, I find no human soul so beautiful these fifteen hundred known years — our supreme modern European man. Him England had contrived to realize. Were there not ideas — ideas poetic and also puritanic, that had to seek utterance in the notablest way ? England had got her Shakespeare, but was now about to get her Milton and Oliver Cromwell. This, too, we will call a new expansion, hard as it might be to articulate and adjust ; this, that a man could actually have a conscience for his own behoof, and not for his priest's only ; that his priest, be who he might, would henceforth have to take that fact along with him. One of the hardest things to adjust. It is not adjusted down to this hour. It lasts onward to the time they call “ glorious revolution ” before so much as a reasonable truce can be made and the war proceed by logic mainly. And still it is war, and no peace, unless we call waste vacancy peace. But it needed to be adjusted, as the others had done, as still others will do.

This period, when the work of centuries which had resulted in the making of the English people was complete, and when they were entering upon their career of world conquest, is of peculiar interest to us. Then it was that from the England of Shakespeare and Bacon and Raleigh, and later from the England of Pym and Hampden and Cromwell and Milton, Englishmen fared forth across the

great ocean to the North American Continent. The first Englishmen to come and to remain here settled on the James River, and there laid the foundation of the great State of Virginia. The next landed much farther to the north. I will again borrow the words of Carlyle to describe the coming of this second English migration : —

But now on the industrial side, while this great constitutional controversy and revolt of the middle class had not ended, had yet but begun, what a shoot was that that England, carelessly, in quest of other objects, struck out across the ocean, into the waste land, which it named New England. Hail to thee, poor little ship *Mayflower*, of *Delft-Haven*! poor common-looking ship, hired by common charter party for coined dollars; calked with mere oakum and tar; provisioned with vulgarest biscuit and bacon; yet what ship *Argo*, or miraculous epic ship built by the sea gods, was other than a foolish bumbarge in comparison? Golden fleeces or the like these sailed for, with or without effect; thou, little *Mayflower*, hadst in thee a veritable Promethean spark; the life spark of the largest nation on our earth, so we may already name the transatlantic Saxon nation. They went seeking leave to hear sermon in their own method, these *Mayflower* Puritans; a most honest indispensable search; and yet, like *Saul the son of Kish*, seeking a small thing, they found this unexpected great thing. Honor to the brave and true! they verily, we say, carry fire from heaven, and have a power that themselves dream not of. Let all men honor Puritanism, since God has so honored it.

At the period of these two English settlements, and just about at the same time, the Dutch settled at the mouth of the Hudson and the Swedes upon the Delaware. Both, be it remembered, were of the same original race stock as the English settlers of Virginia and New England, who were destined to be so predominant in the

North American colonies. At the close of the seventeenth century and during the eighteenth there came to America three other migrations of people sufficiently numerous to be considered in estimating the races from which the colonists were derived. These were the Scotch-Irish, the Germans, and the French Huguenots. The Scotch-Irish, as they are commonly called with us, were immigrants from the north of Ireland. They were chiefly descendants of Cromwell's soldiers, who had been settled in Ulster, and of the Lowland Scotch, who had come to the same region. They were the men who made the famous defense of Londonderry against James II, and differed in no essential respect either of race or language from the English who had preceded them in America. Some of them settled in New Hampshire, but most of them in the western part of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. They were found in all the colonies in a greater or less degree, and were a vigorous body of men, who have contributed very largely to the upbuilding of the United States and played a great part in our history. The German immigrants were the Protestants of the Palatinate, and they settled in large numbers in western Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. The Huguenots, although not very numerous, were a singularly fine body of people. They had shown the highest moral qualities in their long struggle for religious freedom. They had faced war, massacre, and persecution for nearly two centuries, and had never wavered in their constancy to the creed in which they believed. Harried and driven out of France by Louis XIV, they had sought refuge in Holland, in England, and in the New World. They were to be found in this country in all our colonies, and everywhere they became a most valuable addition to our population.

Such, then, briefly were the people composing the colonies when we faced England in the war for independence. It will be observed that, with the exception of the Huguenot French, who formed but a small percentage of the total population, the people of the thirteen colonies were all of the same original race stocks. The Dutch, the Swedes, and the Germans simply blended again with the English-speaking people, who like them were descended from the Germanic tribes whom Cæsar fought and Tacitus described.

During the present century, down to 1875, there have been three large migrations to this country in addition to the always steady stream from Great Britain; one came from Ireland about the middle of the century, and somewhat later one from Germany and one from Scandinavia, in which is included Sweden, Denmark, and Norway. The Irish, although of a different race stock originally, have been closely associated with the English-speaking people for nearly a thousand years. They speak the same language, and during that long period the two races have lived side by side, and to some extent intermarried. The Germans and Scandinavians are again people of the same race stock as the English who founded and built up the colonies. During this century, down to 1875, then, as in the two which preceded it, there had been scarcely any immigration to this country except from kindred or allied races, and no other which was sufficiently numerous to have produced any effect on the national characteristics, or to be taken into account here. Since 1875, however, there has been a great change. While the people who for two hundred and fifty years have been migrating to America have continued to furnish large numbers of immigrants to the United States, other races of totally

different race origin, with whom the English-speaking people have never hitherto been assimilated or brought in contact, have suddenly begun to immigrate to the United States in large numbers. Russians, Hungarians, Poles, Bohemians, Italians, Greeks, and even Asiatics, whose immigration to America was almost unknown twenty years ago, have during the last twenty years poured in in steadily increasing numbers, until now they nearly equal the immigration of those races kindred in blood or speech, or both, by whom the United States has hitherto been built up and the American people formed.

This momentous fact is the one which confronts us to-day, and if continued, it carries with it future consequences far deeper than any other event of our times. It involves, in a word, nothing less than the possibility of a great and perilous change in the very fabric of our race.

The English-speaking race, as I have shown, has been made slowly during the centuries. Nothing has happened thus far to change it radically here. In the United States, after allowing for the variations produced by new climatic influences and changed conditions of life and of political institutions, it is still in the great essentials fundamentally the same race. The additions in this country until the present time have been from kindred people, or from those with whom we have been long allied and who speak the same language. By those who look at this question superficially, we hear it often said that the English-speaking people, especially in America, are a mixture of races. Analysis shows that the actual mixture of blood in the English-speaking race is very small, and that while the English-speaking people are derived through different channels, no doubt, there is among them none the less an overwhelming preponderance of the same race stock,

that of the great Germanic tribes who reached from Norway to the Alps. They have been welded together by more than a thousand years of wars, conquests, migrations, and struggles, both at home and abroad, and in so doing they have attained a fixity and definiteness of national character unknown to any other people. Let me quote on this point a disinterested witness of another race and another language, M. Gustave Le Bon, a distinguished French writer of the highest scientific training and attainments, who says in his very remarkable book on the *Evolution of Races*:—

Most of the historic races of Europe are still in process of formation, and it is important to realize this fact in order to understand their history. The English alone represent a race almost entirely fixed. In them, the ancient Briton, the Saxon, and the Norman have been effaced to form a new and very homogeneous type.

It being admitted, therefore, that a historic race of fixed type has been developed, it remains to consider what this means, what a race is, and what a change would portend. That which identifies a race and sets it apart from others is not to be found merely or ultimately in its physical appearance, its institutions, its laws, its literature, or even its language. These are in the last analysis only the expression or the evidence of race. The achievements of the intellect pass easily from land to land and from people to people. The telephone, invented but yesterday, is used to-day in China, in Australia, or in South Africa as freely as in the United States. The book which the press to-day gives to the world in English is scattered to-morrow throughout the earth in every tongue, and the thoughts of the writer become the property of mankind. You can take a Hindoo and give him the highest educa-

tion the world can afford. He has a keen intelligence. He will absorb the learning of Oxford, he will acquire the manners and habits of England, he will sit in the British Parliament, but you cannot make him an Englishman. Yet, he, like his conqueror, is of the great Indo-European family. But it has taken six thousand years and more to create the differences which exist between them. You cannot efface those differences thus made, by education in a single life, because they do not rest upon the intellect. What, then, is the matter of race which separates the Englishman from the Hindoo and the American from the Indian? It is something deeper and more fundamental than anything which concerns the intellect. We all know it instinctively, although it is so impalpable that we can scarcely define it, and yet is so deeply marked that even the physiological differences between the Negro, the Mongol, and the Caucasian are not more persistent or more obvious. When we speak of a race, then, we do not mean its expressions in art or in language, or its achievements in knowledge. We mean the moral and intellectual characters, which in their association make the soul of a race, and which represent the product of all its past, the inheritance of all its ancestors, and the motives of all its conduct. The men of each race possess an indestructible stock of ideas, traditions, sentiments, modes of thought, an unconscious inheritance from their ancestors, upon which argument has no effect. What makes a race are their mental and, above all, their moral characteristics, the slow growth and accumulation of centuries of toil and conflict. These are the qualities which determine their social efficiency as a people, which make one race rise and another fall, which we draw out of a dim past through many generations of ancestors, about which

we cannot argue, but in which we blindly believe, and which guide us in our short-lived generation as they have guided the race itself across the centuries.

I have cited a witness of the highest authority and entire disinterestedness to support what I have said as to the fixed and determinate character of the English-speaking race. Now that I come to show what that race is by recounting its qualities and characteristics, I will not trust myself to speak, for I might be accused of prejudice, but I will quote again M. Le Bon, who is not of our race nor of our speech.

He says:—

Inability to foresee the remote consequences of actions and the tendency to be guided only by the instinct of the moment, condemn an individual as well as a race to remain always in a very inferior condition. It is only in proportion as they have been able to master their instincts—that is to say, as they have acquired strength of will and consequently empire over themselves—that nations have been able to understand the importance of discipline, the necessity of sacrificing themselves to an ideal and lifting themselves up to civilization. If it were necessary to determine by a single test the social level of races in history, I would take willingly as a standard the aptitude displayed by each in controlling their impulses. The Romans in antiquity, the Anglo-Americans in modern times, represent the people who have possessed this quality in the highest degree. It has powerfully contributed to assure their greatness.

Again he says, speaking now more in detail:—

Let us summarize, then, in a few words the characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon race, which has peopled the United States. There is not perhaps in the world one which is more homogeneous and whose mental constitution is more easy to define in its great outline. The dominant qualities of this mental constitution are, from the standpoint of character, a will power which scarcely

any people except perhaps the Romans have possessed, an unconquerable energy, a very great initiative, an absolute empire over self, a sentiment of independence pushed even to excessive unsociability, a puissant activity, very keen religious sentiments, a very fixed morality, a very clear idea of duty.

Again he says : —

But, above all, it is in a new country like America that we must follow the astonishing progress due to the mental constitution of the English race. Transported to a wilderness inhabited only by savages and having only itself to count upon, we know what that race has done. Scarcely a century has been necessary to those people to place themselves in the first rank of the great powers of the world, and to-day there is hardly one who could struggle against them.

Such achievements as M. Le Bon credits us with are due to the qualities of the American people, whom he, as a man of science looking below the surface, rightly describes as homogeneous. Those qualities are moral far more than intellectual, and it is on the moral qualities of the English-speaking race that our history, our victories, and all our future rest. There is only one way in which you can lower those qualities or weaken those characteristics, and that is by breeding them out. If a lower race mixes with a higher in sufficient numbers, history teaches us that the lower race will prevail. The lower race will absorb the higher, not the higher the lower, when the two strains approach equality in numbers. In other words, there is a limit to the capacity of any race for assimilating and elevating an inferior race ; and when you begin to pour in in unlimited numbers people of alien or lower races of less social efficiency and less moral force, you are running the most frightful risk that a people can run. The lowering of a great race means not only its own decline, but that

of civilization. M. Le Bon sees no danger to us in immigration, and his reason for this view is one of the most interesting things he says. He declares that the people of the United States will never be injured by immigration, because the moment they see the peril the great race instinct will assert itself and shut the immigration out. The reports of the Treasury for the last fifteen years show that the peril is at hand. I trust that the prediction of science is true, and that the unerring instinct of the race will shut the danger out, as it closed the door upon the coming of the Chinese.

That the peril is not imaginary or the offspring of race prejudice, I will prove by another disinterested witness, also a Frenchman. M. Paul Bourget, the distinguished novelist, visited this country a few years ago, and wrote a book containing his impressions of what he saw. He was not content, as many travelers are, to say that our cabs were high-priced, the streets of New York noisy, the cars hot, and then feel that he had disposed of the United States and the people thereof for time and for eternity. M. Bourget saw here a great country and a great people; in other words, a great fact in modern times. Our ways were not his ways, nor our thoughts his thoughts, and he probably liked his own country and his own ways much better; but he none the less studied us carefully and sympathetically. What most interested him was to see whether the socialistic movements, which now occupy the alarmed attention of Europe, were equally threatening here. His conclusion, which I will state in a few words, is of profound interest. He expected to find signs of a coming war of classes, and he went home believing that if any danger threatened the United States it was not from a war of classes, but a war of races.

Mr. President, more precious even than forms of government are the mental and moral qualities which make what we call our race. While those stand unimpaired all is safe. When those decline all is imperiled. They are exposed to but a single danger, and that is by changing the quality of our race and citizenship through the wholesale infusion of races whose traditions and inheritances, whose thoughts and whose beliefs are wholly alien to ours, and with whom we have never assimilated or even been associated in the past. The danger has begun. It is small as yet, comparatively speaking, but it is large enough to warn us to act while there is yet time and while it can be done easily and efficiently. There lies the peril at the portals of our land; there is pressing the tide of unrestricted immigration. The time has certainly come, if not to stop, at least to check, to sift, and to restrict those immigrants. In careless strength, with generous hand, we have kept our gates wide open to all the world. If we do not close them, we should at least place sentinels beside them to challenge those who would pass through. The gates which admit men to the United States and to citizenship in the great republic should no longer be left unguarded.

O Liberty, white Goddess! is it well
 To leave the gates unguarded? On thy breast
 Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of fate,
 Lift the down-trodden, but with hand of steel
 Stay those who to thy sacred portals come
 To waste the gifts of freedom. Have a care
 Lest from thy brow the clustered stars be torn
 And trampled in the dust. For so of old
 The thronging Goth and Vandal trampled Rome,
 And where the temples of the Cæsars stood
 The lean wolf unmolested made her lair.¹

¹ Aldrich, *Unguarded Gates*.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE
CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 27, 1896.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS

MARCH 27, 1896.¹

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: I wish first to thank you for the welcome you gave me to-day. Coming before you after an absence of some months from Massachusetts, meeting a Republican convention for the first time in nearly two years, I assure you that it makes me feel more strongly than ever that there is nothing which I value or appreciate more than the cordial greeting of the Republican Convention of Massachusetts.

I also have to thank you for the honorable responsibility that you have imposed upon me to-day. I think I interpret aright not merely the words of your resolutions, but what you intended when you selected my associates and myself to represent you at St. Louis.² I think I understand you to mean that you desire us to go out there and make

¹ This speech was made without a line written beforehand or even a note. My only text, therefore, was the report which appeared the next morning in the *Boston Journal*, and I have allowed it to stand as reported except for a few corrections made at the moment, with all its imperfections on its head, and with all the interruptions as set down by the stenographer.

² The National Republican Convention was held that year in St. Louis.

the best fight we can for the nomination of Mr. Reed, and that you wish us also to go there and make a stubborn and determined Massachusetts fight for a right platform, for sound money, and for a protective tariff.

We are on the eve of a great Republican victory. It is not worth while to enter into a discussion of details. The country is tired of that superlative failure, the Democratic party. The people are going to turn them out. They are going to give us our chance, and it behooves us to see that we use that great opportunity well. We do not go to St. Louis to nominate a candidate simply ; we go there to nominate a President—a grave task, and one on which the fate of the party and the welfare of our country will depend for the next four years and for many years to come!

Therefore, what we should consider with great care to-day is not only our selection of a candidate, but also the statement of principles which we present to the country. We need a candidate, we need a President, who will not only show his fidelity to his party principles—every Republican candidate is faithful to Republican principles—but who will be a leader, a man who can unite the party, who can carry the legislation which the country demands ; who on the 5th day of next March will be ready to summon Congress in extra session and not stop to consider appointments, or patronage, or anything else, but say to Congress and the country : “The Treasury is empty ; we need revenue ; we need a proper tariff ; give me those measures to sign.”

It is no light task to take up the work of the government after the Democratic party has been performing with it for two years. We have got to meet a short revenue, an insolvent treasury, a growing debt, a bad tariff, a

disordered currency. These are grave problems, requiring all the strength, all the power that we have. We took the country once before after the Democrats had been playing with it. We took it in 1861. It was in a far, far worse condition then than it is to-day, bad as to-day's condition is. We met the issues then. Have we fallen short of the old standard? Shall we not be able to meet them now? I think we shall. But we shall have much to do. We have no promises of millenniums to make. Promises of millenniums were made by the Democratic party, and the country has been starving in that barren pasture for the last three years. We say we are going to do our best. That we can promise you. We believe we can make this country a somewhat better place for the average man to live in than it has been for the last three years. We can, we believe, put a stop, indeed we have already put a stop, to the free-trade agitation, which, in its last extreme, as I have seen in the newspapers in Boston, leads men to approve a representative of the United States abroad when he slanders his own countrymen, and to resist the restriction of immigration into the United States. That is the final word of free trade. We have choked that already.

I believe that we are going to give you a better tariff, that we will pass one that will give protection and steadiness to business. We will give the government revenue, so that we shall not have a deficit every month. We will try to bring the borrowing to an end. These things I am confident we can do.

And we also have to meet the money question, which has been so ably, so powerfully presented to you by the chairman of the convention to-day. That is a far more difficult question to deal with. We cannot hope for such

success immediately there as we can in other directions, but we must face it without flinching.

I am not going to weary you by entering into a discussion of the financial question. International bimetallism, in which many of us believe, is not to-day a present question. If bimetallism is possible, if the demonetization of silver by the nations of the world is an evil, as many believe it is, it is a world evil, and must be met by a world remedy. It cannot be met by our undertaking to go alone to free silver, which means silver monometallism in this country, ruin to credit, disaster to business. Against that we must set our faces.

The position of the Republican party is well known by acts which speak louder than platforms. When the House of Representatives voted on free silver, only twenty-seven Republicans were found to vote in favor of it. The Republican party in the House voted nearly nine to one against it. The Democrats voted two to one in favor of it. In the Senate the Republicans voted nearly two to one against it, and the Democrats two to one in its favor. That is the record of the party, and it is all made up. Every intelligent man ought to know, after the vote of the House, of the men fresh from the people, that no free-coinage law can pass Congress. Let business men take that much comfort to heart. That fact has been demonstrated by the present House of Representatives, but that is not enough.

We want to speak, in my judgment, as we have spoken in our resolutions to-day. We have made for years concession after concession to our brethren of the silver states, and this year they took a tariff bill by the throat, which had no connection with the silver question, and destroyed it in the Senate. We must take our stand. The day of

concessions has passed. If concessions are to come, it is time they came from the other side.

Now that is the position I want to see the Republican party take. We lost our bond bill with the silver business ; as I said, we also lost our tariff bill, but not merely by the votes of the five Republican silver Senators. Don't imagine they were the only people who refused to take it up. They were supported by the united vote of the Democratic and Populist parties, and the condition of the United States Senate to-day is owing to the fact that so many seats are filled with Democrats and Populists who landed there on that great wave known as tariff reform.

The House has been all right. They sent up in one week the bond bill and a tariff bill. Get the Senate as you got the House, get the President as you got the House, and you will have no trouble with your tariff or your currency measures. They will be brought up and voted on.

These questions are of vast moment ; they are of the deepest importance to the business interests of the country. We all of us feel their gravity ; they touch us at every point. To them we must give our best effort for their right settlement.

But these are not the only questions. There are questions which confront every nation, as they confront every man, which cannot be settled on business principles, which have nothing to do with business, which must be decided outside of the question of money. Suppose, for example, the public school system of our country is attacked. Are we to be told that we must not defend it because it is likely to make disturbance in the money market ? Never in the world.

I believe, for one, that we ought to restrict immigration. I think the manner in which we deal with that question

is of greater importance to the future of this country than either tariff or currency ; and am I to be deterred from dealing with it because somebody tells me that the capitalist who is building a railroad cannot get his labor as cheaply as if the gates were not shut, or that he wants to import foreign labor freely for his mills? I reply to him, "This is not a money question. It involves the quality of American citizenship and the wages of American labor, and those must be considered on different grounds."

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, to the same class of questions belong our relations with the other nations of the earth — what is commonly called our foreign policy. We have had two questions of this character before the Congress this winter. The first one is the Venezuela case, famous and known to you all. For twenty years we have been seeking to settle that question by arbitration ; for twenty years we have been put off. At last we met with a blunt refusal, and the President replied with the message of the 17th of December, asserting the Monroe Doctrine and the rights of the United States.

Congress came to his support. I will not pause to discuss the question of manners and phrases ; I am only concerned with the principle which he announced. Congress came to his side without a dissenting voice. The American people came to his side like one man.

There was a little discordant note even in that first rush when the President appealed to the country — one little note coming from the small and dwindling band who for many years past have devoted themselves exclusively to the worship of the President of the United States — that little Mugwump band ! Think of the horror of their position ! They were forced to choose between their idol and England ! Gentlemen, let us be just, even to our opponents

— they did not hesitate ; they threw their idol in the dust and stood by England.

Now, what was the question? A great many words have been written and spoken about it, and yet it can be stated in a sentence. There is a disputed territory down there which involves the mouth of the Orinoco, one of the great river systems of South America, and England said that territory belonged to her as heir of the Dutch. Venezuela said it belonged to her as the heir of Spain. England declined to arbitrate it, and our position is this: We do not care if, by the award of an impartial tribunal, England gets every inch of her claim. We are not struggling for South American territory. But it is vital to us how England gets it. If she takes it by the strong hand — disputed land, fairly disputed — if she takes it by the strong hand and says, “ We will not arbitrate,” and we yield, we can offer no opposition to any other European Power that chooses to come in — and they would come in, and they would parcel out South America as they parceled out Africa. The hunger for land is on the nations of the earth to-day, and they would soon be there parceling it out, and we should have tied our hands by our action in regard to Venezuela, thereby preventing our making a remonstrance. We should find ourselves in a short time surrounded by formidable neighbors, whose presence would compel us to become a great military Power like the Powers of Europe.

That is what is at stake in Venezuela — not a few hundred miles of swamp, if you please, but a great principle ; and the President made his declaration and Congress stood firm, and has stood firm.

When I say Congress has stood firm, I mean that which is greater than Congress and without which Congresses and

Presidents can do nothing — the American people — have stood firm.

The cry of war was raised, stocks were poured out from London into the New York market. It was done to drive us from our position, for there never was any talk of war among responsible men charged with the heavy duty of government. No man, no sane, conscientious man, can regard a war between the two great English-speaking peoples as other than the most dire calamity. I should be the last to advocate war, and never have done so. War would be a calamity, and there never was any foundation in the cry. We have no desire to pick a quarrel with England, and England has no desire to fight us. We want only, and we mean to have, a just consideration of our rights.

A great firm of London bankers, the Rothschilds, published a letter in a newspaper of New York, owned and controlled by a man who is an alien at heart, even if he does hold naturalization papers, in which they said that if we did not yield on Venezuela they would not lend us money. Let me say to those gentlemen and their allies that the American people may have their faults, but they are not for sale. They cannot be bought, and they cannot be bullied, and they have stood firm. And what is the result? Parliament has met. We said — now, mark what we claimed! — “This concerns us, and we claim the right to intervene for our own safety.” We said: “The Monroe Doctrine applies to it.” Parliament met, and the Queen’s speech said that it welcomed the coöperation of the United States; in other words, admitted our right to intervene. Lord Rosebery, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Balfour, all made public admission in Parliament and elsewhere that they fully conceded the validity of

the Monroe Doctrine. I think I should be content to stand on the speech made by Sir William Harcourt in the House of Commons as an exposition of the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and the fairness of the American people.

After England has conceded the justice of our contentions, is it worth while for Americans to argue that we were wrong?

We did not go into this business to humiliate anybody. We have no exultation to express. We have won our case. The rest of the settlement, which is sure to come, is but a detail. The principle has been vindicated. We are content. And let me say to you now that no such act for peace has been performed by this country since the rebellion fell at Appomattox, as the position—the firm, dignified position—taken by the American people on this question. England understands us better. She has learned more about us in six months than she had learned before in half a century. There will be a better understanding between the two great nations than ever before. She has listened too long to the voices that misrepresent America, and now she has heard from the real America. And England respects the men who love their country. You never find an Englishman who does not believe in England against all the world, and I wish that some people here would imitate that part of the English example.

The other question that came before us was Cuba. On that I wish to express myself with great precision, and I have written a few lines. I will ask your patience while I read them.

“For myself I cannot doubt that in the interest of both parties, Cuba and Spain, and in the interest of humanity

also, the contest should be closed. This is my judgment on the facts, so far as known to me. Cuba must be saved from its bloody delirium, or little will be left for the final conqueror. Nor can the enlightened mind fail to see that the Spanish power on this island is an anachronism. The day of European colonies has passed, at least in this hemisphere, where the rights of man were first proclaimed and self-government first organized."

To-morrow morning you will read in one paper in Boston, and perhaps in one in New York, that that is the utterance of a jingo; that I am a wanton, noisy demagogue, who goes about needlessly wounding the feelings of a country with whom we maintain friendly relations.

Gentlemen, I will set no traps for the feet of the unwary. Those words that I read to you were the words of Charles Sumner, speaking to a Republican Convention. They are the words of Charles Sumner speaking to a Massachusetts Republican Convention in 1869, as I now speak to you. On that statement, I am content to stand.

At that time the insurrection in Cuba had only lasted a year. It was confined to the extreme eastern end of the island. Sumner did not think the facts warranted the recognition of belligerency, although he said that men might easily differ. But there was one fact, he said, which controlled him entirely as against the recognition of belligerency, and that was that human slavery existed in Cuba, and with his feelings he could not support granting belligerency to a people who held slaves.

But even then, with that great obstacle, long since cleared away, before him, even then he said he hoped the United States might use its good offices to bring that terrible war to an end.

What I have read there as the utterance of Charles Sum-

ner is the position of my honored colleague and friend. He has expressed in the Senate his deep sympathy with the Cubans. He has stated that he preferred and had paired in favor of the Cameron resolution, which is a resolution exactly carrying out the idea of our resolutions to-day, that we should use our good offices to obtain the recognition of Cuba's independence. Like Sumner, he does not feel, as I feel, that the fact of belligerency is established.

I agree with him in his sympathy with Cuba. I agree with him in the great principle that is at stake. I agree with him that the resolution which he prefers is much the best. It is now on its road to passage in the House. I was willing to vote even for the House resolution rather than get no expression at all. He was not, and people at home have busied themselves in portraying a difference between my colleague and myself. No such difference exists. Please God, none ever will. He is not only my colleague, but my friend. He is not present here to-day, and I can say to you of him, what you all know, that he is giving now, as he has always given, a pure and honorable life, great abilities, great scholarship, to the service of humanity and of America. Ever since I had the high honor to sit beside him in the Senate he has been the most considerate of colleagues, the kindest of friends. We are in absolute harmony on every question of principle that faces the nation to-day. I trust you will pardon so much of personal explanation, but misrepresentations have been made which I desire to correct once and for all.

There is Cuba, there it lies, that great island, athwart the Gulf, right in the pathway of our coastwise commerce, commanding the entrance to the Nicaragua Canal. If she was free, her markets would be ours. We take ninety per cent of all her products. She takes scarcely any-

thing from us, owing to the Spanish laws, but that market would be ours if she were free. The control of the Gulf would be removed from all possibility of danger if she were free. She would be our ally. She would have to rely on us for support. That is the material view, the money view, the pecuniary view.

Look on the other side, on the broader, on the better side. There in Cuba men have been fighting for their liberties with short intervals since 1825. They have been struggling to get free from Spain. Let me tell you, it does not, in my judgment, lie in American mouths to utter anything but sympathy for a colony struggling for independence. It is no answer to say to me that they cannot set up a government, if they win, as good as our government. They will set up a better one than Spain gives them, and it will be an advance on the highway of civilization. They are fighting for their liberty. My sympathies are with them. I think that, as Edward Everett said, Cuba is an American question. We cannot shirk it, if we are going to be a great nation and take a great nation's responsibilities. And that is the whole of the Cuban question to-day.

Look at these two questions for a moment, one involving aggressions on our rights — on rights which we believe with great unanimity concern deeply the peace and safety of the United States — while the other involves a case of humanity, as I consider it. I have formed the opinions which I have expressed on those questions by a very careful study of all the facts and circumstances for considerably more than a year.

But I did not rest there; I have looked also to see what the traditions and the history of Massachusetts had to say to me where questions involving the rights of my country,

and others as I believed involving the interests of humanity right here at our threshold, were at stake.

The first public man I ever saw, when I was a mere child in my father's house, was Charles Sumner. The first voice I ever heard speak on public affairs was his, and he was pleading the rights of humanity. Even a child could understand that. He bore stripes for what he believed, and you could not turn him from his great struggle for the black man by telling him that the negro could not make as good a government as the Anglo-Saxon.

Go back a little further. There is Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, declaring to the Austrian representative that every people struggling for freedom had the sympathy of the people of the United States! They sent for Kossuth, and brought him out here in a man-of-war. We are told to-day that we are too rough in our utterances about Spain. But it was Daniel Webster who said in his letter to Hülsemann: "The great Republic controls an area beside which the possessions of the House of Hapsburg are but a patch on the earth's surface." It was the same Daniel Webster who stood in the Congress thirty years before and pleaded the cause of the Greeks battling for their liberties, while he denounced Turkey in those rolling sentences of which he alone was master.

Go back a little further. A British ship had taken some of our seamen out of an American ship, and the President had asked for measures to resist the outrage. John Quincy Adams was one of the Senators from Massachusetts. The President was not of his party; I am sure that the President's policy was not of his choosing. He did not like it, but he stood up in his place in the Senate and said that, in the presence of a controversy with a foreign government, when "the President has recommended this measure on

his high responsibility, I would not deliberate — I would act ! ”

That was the voice of Massachusetts then. Those are the lessons I read in the lives of three of my great predecessors.

Let us go a little further and see what more we can learn in Massachusetts history about the duties of her sons when the rights of the country and the rights of humanity are at stake. Go out with me into the streets of Boston ; go down to Faneuil Hall — it is a historic spot. Stop there in front of the picture which hangs on those walls of the second Massachusetts President. To those silent lips put the question : “ Do you think we should sustain the Monroe Doctrine ? ”

Ask it of John Quincy Adams. What do you think would be his reply ? He formulated it.

Go out again ; walk up into Dock Square. What is the statue you see there ? It is that of Sam Adams. Close by is the place where the first blood flowed in the Revolution. Hard by is the chamber where, in the gathering twilight, he faced the crown officers and said to them : “ You must remove both regiments. If you can remove one you can remove both — both regiments or none.” He looks forth over the harbor where the tea fell. Stop in front of that statue and put to it the question : “ When the rights of your country are at stake, shall you resist or shall you yield ? ” If you touched those bronze lips with the fire of speech, what do you think they would say ? They never said “ Yield ” in their life !

We are all agreed about Sam Adams to-day. Do you think he did n't have his critics ? Eleven hundred of them sailed out to Halifax with Lord Howe. As they sailed out of the harbor George Washington rode in at the other

end of the town, and we have put up a statue to him also. It is down there in the Public Garden — the statue of the man who broke the empire of England and laid the foundations of a mightier empire here.

Close by is the statue of Charles Sumner, and the battle of his life was for human rights. A little farther away is the statue of William Lloyd Garrison. He was mobbed in the streets of Boston! Mobbed, and for what? For pleading the rights of humanity, even if the skin that covered the humanity was black. There sits his statue in Commonwealth Avenue. I do not see the effigies of the men who mobbed him.

Go up the hill; take one more look. There is an unfinished monument in front of the State House, opposite the steps where John A. Andrew sent the soldiers off to the war. There is an unfinished monument! Turn now to your Harvard biographies, read there the letters of the first colonel of the first Massachusetts black regiment, and they will tell you of the prejudice, of the obloquy, of all he had to encounter while he was raising that regiment. It was not because he was fighting for the Union; it was because, in addition to fighting for the Union, he was trying to help a race to freedom by proving to all mankind that they deserved their freedom because they could fight for it. That is what he was meeting obloquy, reproach, and prejudice for, and he went off with his black troops, and he fell there at Fort Wagner; and slavery, in its ferociousness, even on its death-bed, cried out: "Bury him with his niggers" — one of the noblest epitaphs ever uttered over man. And now Boston is raising a statue to his memory, and there, carved by the chisel of the greatest of living sculptors, Robert Shaw and his black soldiers will ride together, forever ride!

Those are the memories, those are the traditions, such is the inspiration and such the lesson that I find in Massachusetts history.

I leave the history ; I will come to to-day. I will come to you, voices of the present. I will come to you — to you who followed the gleaming flag of the republic through four years of civil war and brought back the white flag of Massachusetts, all the whiter because it was torn with shot and black with smoke.

I turn to you, the brothers and the sons of those men ; to you, heirs of the great Republican heritage of union and freedom ; to you, within the borders of whose Commonwealth lie guarded Concord, Lexington, and Bunker Hill ; to you, children of the Pilgrim and the Puritan ; to you, citizens of the great republic ! To you I come and ask the same counsel that I asked from the history of the old State, and your answer, I know, will be the same.

Gentlemen, I have trespassed too far upon your time already. I have spoken because I wished to speak to you, the representatives of the party to whom I owe everything that I have in public life, and I have been speaking to you on these questions because they lie very near my heart. They seem to me to involve a very great principle.

No one has a greater admiration than I for the marvelous achievements of the American people in the last century, for the conquest of this mighty continent, for all the material welfare which has sprung up as if by magic from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Our business enterprise, our business intelligence, our business activity, are among the glories of the republic. I have labored ever since I have been in public life to advance by every means in my power every measure that makes for the business interests of the country. No one values their importance more highly

than I. So long as I may continue in public life you may count on me to make all the best endeavor that my ability will permit on every business question, from the great questions of sound money and a proper tariff down through the whole range. But, gentlemen, I have seen it constantly stated — and this is the point I wish to make — that we must not deal with anything but business questions.

Now, there is a great deal more than that in the life of every great nation. There is patriotism, love of country, pride of race, courage, manliness, the things which money cannot make and which money cannot buy. The possession of those qualities in the one, the lack of them in the other, made the Romans prætors and the Greeks barbers. That which ruined Rome was the loss of those great qualities. The Empire fell because the Romans lost the great national aspirations which had made Rome. When everything is money, and there is no other standard to try every question by, decadence has begun, the hour of the downfall is approaching. Thank Heaven, it is far distant from the American people. There is no more patriotic people on earth than the people of the United States, none more patriotic than the people of Massachusetts, none more patriotic than the great body of the people of Boston, just as patriotic to-day as when the little three-hilled town faced the British Empire in arms. There is no change. The great qualities are all there.

But you know and I know that there are certain quarters where it is the fashion to sneer at patriotism, and to write patriotism and Americanism between inverted commas. You know that practice prevails, and that a man is said to be a demagogue and talking buncombe and all that because he alludes to patriotism, and that the only true patriots are those who never speak of it but carry it

about locked up in the silent recesses of their hearts. Why, where would that argument lead you? Are we to stop reading and preaching from the gospels because they are nineteen hundred years old and men have drawn comfort and hope and consolation from them for all that time? Are we to stop reading and preaching from them because all men are agreed about the gospels? I think it is not only well to have patriotism; I think it is well occasionally to talk about it.

I for one do not propose, in view of some of the objections that have been made to the attitude of Congress and of the President and of the American people, to remain silent. You may call it sentiment or passion or what you will, but love of country is one of the great moving causes of national life. When we look at that flag, what is it that makes our hearts throb? If you see it in a foreign land, as I did last summer, after months of separation, what is it that makes your throat choke and your eyes get damp? Is it because a great many men have made money under it? I believe that that flag is a great deal more than the sign of a successful national shop, never to be unfurled for fear that the trader on the opposite side of the way may have his feelings ruffled; I think it is a great deal more than that. And when I look at it, I do not see and you do not see there the graven image of the dollar; you do not read there the motto of the epicure, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." No; you read on that flag the old Latin motto, "Per aspera ad astra," — through toil and conflict to the stars.

You do not see the dollar on it. But when you look, and your heart swells within you as you look, the memories that come are very different. If you see any faces there, they are the faces of Washington and his Continen-

tals behind him, marching from defeat at Long Island to victory at Trenton, to misery at Valley Forge, to final triumph at Yorktown. Look again, and we all see the face of Lincoln. The mighty host are there of the men who have lived for their country and given their lives for their country, and labored for it, each in his separate way, and believed in it and loved it. They are all there, from the great chiefs to the boys who fell in Baltimore. That is what I see, that is what you see. That is why we love it, because it means this great country and all the people. It means all the struggles and sufferings we have gone through, all our hopes, all our aspirations. It means that we are a great nation and intend to take a nation's part in the family of nations. It means that we are the guardians of this Western Hemisphere and will not have it rashly invaded. It means the one successful experiment of representative democracy. It means victorious democracy. That is what it means, and that is what I see there and that is what you see there. And, much as I care for business and economic questions, I never will admit that they are all, or that the duty of a public man ceases with them. There are other questions that must be dealt with also. I never will admit that that beloved flag is to me merely the symbol of a land where I can live in rich content and make money. No; I see it as the American poet saw it: —

And fixed as yonder orb divine
That saw thy bannered blaze unfurled,
Shall thy proud stars resplendent shine
The guard and glory of the world.

SPEECH AT THE ALUMNI DINNER.

HARVARD COMMENCEMENT, JUNE, 1896.

SPEECH AT THE ALUMNI DINNER.

HARVARD COMMENCEMENT, JUNE, 1896.

I THANK you for this greeting, which indicates that you agree with me in the position I have lately taken at St. Louis. There was never any doubt as to the position of the great Republican party, to which I belong, upon the money question, but there was a doubt as to whether they would declare that position without reserve. With the delegates from our dear old State, and with the leaders of other states, I had a share in framing the declaration of the party upon the money question, and we made it so plain and so honest that no man can misinterpret it. I am glad that my action in this respect meets with your approval. Praise and blame often come to a public man from the same quarter at not remote intervals. But no public man can afford to shape his course from desire of the one or dread of the other. There is only one absolute master whom I recognize, and that is my own conviction of what is right. There is only one approval that is absolutely essential to me, and that is the approval of my own conscience. If I may borrow the words of Descartes, "I early made up my mind that, in emergencies which demanded action, I would act promptly and to the best of my judgment, and would then abide the result without repenting."

But, Mr. President, I did not rise to speak of myself

or of politics. I am a member of the Class which celebrates to-day the twenty-fifth anniversary of its graduation. On such an occasion there is much that is joyous, much which touches the tender chords of memory ; but yet, after all, the stones which mark the resting-place of the buried years lead us most naturally to some serious reflections. I was told last night at my Class dinner, by one speaking with authority, that the old college of our day was utterly gone. We came as a class just at the parting of the ways. We were for two years under the old system and for two years under the new. We have watched with pride the vast growth of Harvard since we left Cambridge. We realize that the class which graduates to-day is nearly as large as the entire college which we knew. We understand that a Faculty of ninety members can hardly sustain the work which in our time was performed by twenty. We have seen great endowments given to Harvard. We have seen new buildings spring up in all directions. We have beheld the old college change into the great university at the touch of the enchanter's wand. And yet, Mr. President, I should be grieved to think that the old college had entirely gone. The most brilliant of American journalists, a graduate of Harvard, is reported to have said, when he bought the New York "Sun," that he threw away everything except the name. I should be sorry to think that this policy had been pursued at Harvard. There were some qualities about the old college which I trust will never die, but will always remain as they were then, — characteristic of Harvard.

Let me very briefly suggest what I mean. At the risk of being thought an extreme and moss-grown conservative, I will mention that during the four years of my Class in college we won three out of four university boat-races,

besides sending a crew to England. We won all the baseball matches there were to win. I know that the reply to this is that these things are only athletics. So be it. I happen to be one of those, Mr. President, who believe profoundly in athletic contests. The time given to athletic contests and the injuries incurred on the playing-field are part of the price which the English-speaking race has paid for being world-conquerors.

But there is another side to athletic victories. They are the manifestation and evidence of a spirit which is all-important. I was asked last spring to come out here and speak to the boys on football. I replied that I knew little of football, and was certainly not an expert at the game. "We do not want you to talk about football," was the answer; "we want you to speak on the spirit of victory." That is the spirit which existed in the old college, — the spirit of victory. It is but another phrase for what the philosopher dealing with nations calls social efficiency. It is the spirit which subordinates the individual to the group, and which enables that group, whether it be a college or a nation, to achieve great results and attain to high ideals. Individualism carried to its last extreme has made Poland a geographical expression. Social efficiency has made the English-speaking people the conquering race of modern times. It is that spirit of victory, that loyalty to a name, an idea, a sentiment, that capacity for acting together, that enthusiasm which always existed in the old college, which I would see preserved in the Harvard of to-day. A nation must have that spirit to succeed in the world, and a college must have that spirit to succeed in the nation. I want Harvard to play the part which belongs to her in the great drama of American life. Therefore I want her to be filled with the spirit of victory.

The president has said that there are many evils, many shortcomings, in our politics. So there are. No one knows it so well as a man in public life. But let us not rail at them. Let us go down into the dust and heat and try to cure them. And, above all, do not let us permit the shortcomings to obscure the great triumphs of the century. It is well to remember what we have done as a nation. They may call us money-makers, shopkeepers, if you will, but the American people have made the greatest sacrifices to a sentiment, to union and to freedom, that any people on earth can show. Here in the United States is the greatest field in the world for human endeavor and for human aspiration. Very early I took to my heart the words of Emerson, the greatest intellect, perhaps, that Harvard has upon her roll. It was he who said, "Let the passion for America cast out the passion for Europe." I would have the passion for America enter into every man's soul. This great democracy is moving onward to its great destiny. Woe to the men or to the nations who try to bar its imperial march. Before us lie great problems and great possibilities. In the future of the United States I want Harvard to be in the forefront. I want her to wield the influence and take the part to which her traditions and her past, to which all she is and all she hopes to be, entitle her.

INTERVENTION IN CUBA.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, APRIL 13, 1898.

INTERVENTION IN CUBA.

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 149) for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect —

MR. LODGE said : —

MR. PRESIDENT: During the entire session, since the 1st of December, and more especially since the destruction of the *Maine* fell with a great shock upon the people of the United States, I have felt it my duty as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which I have the honor to belong, to maintain an absolute silence on all matters connected with the questions pending between this country and Spain. I have broken through that rule on but one occasion, and that was when I counseled in this Chamber silence and patience until we could hear the report of the court of inquiry. Neither by speech here nor by interview or publication elsewhere have I broken the rule which I imposed upon myself.

But, Mr. President, the moment has now come when the committee to which I belong has made its report, and I feel it to be my duty to state the reasons which govern me and control my vote at this great crisis, and to try to make them plain to the people whom I have the very high honor to represent.

Mr. President, I think there is one point on which all men in this country are agreed to-day, no matter how they may differ on one proposition or another, and that agreement is that this situation must end. We cannot go on indefinitely with this strain, this suspense, and this uncertainty, this tottering upon the verge of war. It is killing to business. It is ruinous to our people in a thousand ways. It is discreditable to our government and our country. If we are not to take action in regard to Cuba in order to bring this situation to an end, then let us stand up in the face of the world and say that we wash our hands of the whole affair; let us say that we will not intervene to save the starving, to put an end to hostilities, and that we will turn the case of the Maine over to a referee. If we are not prepared to do that, then let us act the other way. But whatever happens, let us end this state of unendurable suspense. That, I believe, Mr. President, is the one great desire of the entire country.

The President has submitted this momentous question to the Congress of the United States. In his hands are placed by the Constitution all the diplomatic functions of the government. He alone can address foreign powers; he alone can carry on correspondence through his ministers and officers. Congress has no diplomatic functions whatever. The President has told us that diplomacy is exhausted, and he has handed the case over to us. What power have we got? We have but one, Mr. President. The Constitution gives to Congress—I mean to both Houses constituting the entire Congress—but one power in relation to foreign countries,—the last great weapon in the armory of nations, the war power.

When a President of the United States says to Con-

gress, as President McKinley has said, that he can go no further with diplomacy in a controversy with a foreign nation, and remits that question to the Congress of the United States, he invites them to use the only weapon they possess. The mere fact of remitting the question to Congress is invoking Congress to use the most awful power which the Constitution has conferred upon it.

That is the situation in which we stand to-day, Mr. President. We here can open no new negotiations with Madrid; we can enter on no correspondence with any other nation on the face of the earth. All that we can do is to exercise the one great power of peace or war. The President has asked us to exert that power, and in a certain way. He has invited us to exercise it by clothing him with the power to intervene by force of arms in order to produce certain results.

My deep desire, Mr. President, and all the small influence that I may possess, has been given throughout to the one object of sustaining the President of the United States and seeking in every possible way to preserve unity between the Congress and the Executive; for I believe, when we are face to face with a foreign power, that there is one duty that overrides all others, higher than politics and higher than everything else, and that is that the Congress and the people and the Executive of the United States should stand absolutely together. And now, Mr. President, when the President comes to Congress and invokes our aid in a controversy with a foreign country, and asks us to give him power to intervene, I desire that that great power of war should be given to him in that way.

I am against a declaration of war, but I favor giving the President the power to intervene. I am against recog-

nizing the government of the insurgent republic because the President of the United States, in his high responsibility, has advised Congress strongly against it. I will not myself part from that unity which I consider so much more important than aught else, and differ on that point.

I do not care to argue here the question of recognizing or not recognizing the government of the insurgents. Powerful arguments can be made both ways. We have heard one in the message of the President; we have heard another to-day from the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Foraker] on the other side. We heard but yesterday in the Foreign Relations Committee the advice of General Lee, who has conferred such honor upon the United States by the manner in which he has represented this country at Havana, and his advice is that we should not recognize the insurgent government.

Therefore, Mr. President, without arguing that point further, I beg to say that I stand with the majority of the committee and with the President of the United States in opposing the recognition of the insurgent government at this time. It can be done, if necessary, at any moment. The President has nothing to do but to ask Mr. Palma to the White House, and the Cuban Republic stands up erect and recognized. We may safely trust that power to the President.

I said, sir, that the President has asked us for intervention. The committee have given it to him. It was not the form of resolution which I personally preferred. I voted for another in the committee. But, Mr. President, what I desired more than any special form of resolution was the unity of action of the Government of the United States in the crisis to which we have arrived.

Therefore I voted to bring these resolutions into the Senate; voted to do it with all the other members of the committee. Nor do I think, Mr. President, that there is much use in differing about the words in which we order intervention. We have been wandering too long as a country amid the delusions and snares of diplomacy. Let us now come out into the clear light of day and look facts squarely in the face.

When we authorize the President to intervene and use the Army and Navy of the United States, whether we do it in the language of the message, or in the language of the House of Representatives, or in the language of the Senate resolution, we create a state of war. Let us not deceive ourselves at this solemn hour. Forms of words are of but little moment in a crisis like this. It is the great central fact that concerns the people to-day. The President has asked us to mail his arm to strike with the Army and the Navy of the United States; to authorize him to go down into Cuba and enforce the pacification of the island. He has asked us to authorize him to set up a government there which shall be a stable government, and a government "capable of observing international obligations." I quote the President's own words.

What kind of government can alone observe international obligations? Only an independent government, Mr. President. Therefore the President of the United States asks us to authorize him to use the Army and the Navy to stop the fighting in Cuba and establish an independent government in that island. How can there be an independent government in Cuba while Spain is there? It is an impossibility. The recommendations of the message mean that Spain must leave that island, and I, for

one, think that if that is the purpose of the message, as it clearly is, there is no harm and much good in telling the truth. If we intervene, we do not go there to take Gomez by the throat and make him stop fighting. We go there to put Spain out of that island, for in no other way can we create a government capable of observing its international obligations.

The President has asked Congress to sustain him in that policy in its broad general lines. As I have sustained him hitherto in every step that he has taken, so far as my very humble influence went, I sustain him now when he asks us to give him this last great power of the Constitution. Therefore, Mr. President, when we vote to give the President of the United States power to intervene in the affairs of another country with the Army and Navy of the United States, we clothe him with the war power, and we had better face that great responsibility and look it in the eye like men, and not attempt to shrink from what it means and try feebly to pretend that it is not there.

No man can be more averse to war than I, no one can dread more than I any act which will plunge the country into war. Mr. President, such measures as I have voted for in past years in the Senate, since the Cuban crisis has been upon the country, I have supported not merely because I thought they made for the interests of the insurgents, with whom I sympathize in the strongest possible manner, because they are fighting for freedom, but because I thought then, as I think now, that they were the true road to the preservation of peace.

If two years ago we had recognized the belligerency of the Cuban insurgents they would have been able to raise money, to hoist a flag at sea, and open a port; they would

then have won their independence, in my judgment, and we never should have been involved. If one year ago last January we had recognized their independence, again they would have been able to raise money, to open a port, and to have established their independence themselves. I so believed then ; I so believe now. Both those propositions passed by the Senate of the United States were smothered elsewhere by a wisdom which I shall not question ; but I think that each of those refusals to act kept alive the Cuban difficulty, and the longer it was kept alive the nearer and the surer war came to us.

I have also for many years advocated a powerful navy and strong coast defenses. I have advocated them because I believed that in them was the great guaranty of peace. Mr. President, if we had to-day, as we ought to have, twenty battleships and a hundred torpedo boats, there never would have been a Cuban question ; we should have been so ready and so strong that we could have laid our hands on the shoulder of Spain and said, " You must stop " ; and the contest would have been so hopeless that it never would have been entered upon. Thousands of men who fill graves in Cuba to-day, tortured into them by starvation, would be alive, and the *Maine* would still ride the seas. But, Mr. President, more conservative principles prevailed and we have not the large navy we ought to have.

I believe in preparation for war as Washington advocated it ; I believe in a rigid exclusion from America of any European extension, which was the great doctrine of the generation which followed Washington. These principles have been scoffed at as the doctrine of " jingoes." Ah, Mr. President, as Coleridge says, " Old faiths often become new heresies." If we had clung to the old faiths,

if we had kept our navy and our defenses as Washington advised, if we had looked a little further ahead into what the Monroe Doctrine meant, we should not be standing on the verge of war to-day. We failed, as I believe, in certain obvious duties, and the inexorable law of compensation has brought the inevitable penalty to our doors.

Mr. President, we are not in this crisis by an accident. We have not been brought here by chance or by clamorous politicians or by yellow journals. We are face to face with Spain to-day in the fulfillment of a great movement which has run through the centuries. Out of the war which Spain wages, and the manner in which she wages it, have come starvation and the destruction of the Maine. The war comes out of Spanish misgovernment and Spanish corruption. That corruption is not of yesterday. It is very, very old. It has cost Spain all her continental colonies. It existed two hundred years ago. You can see it all portrayed in that beautiful picture of character and manners which Le Sage drew in the history of Gil Blas of Santillane. Spain was corrupt then; it was misgoverned then; and out of it has come to-day the Cuban war.

Even at this moment the corruption which Le Sage described is worse than ever. Spain is on her death-bed, buried in debt, bleeding at every vein from the revolutions in her colonies, and her officers and officials rob her, dying, as she is, in the eyes of the world. We asked General Lee yesterday when he was before us if the \$600,000 said to have been appropriated by Spain for the relief of the reconcentrados would reach them or would be spent on the Spanish soldiers,—for they are starving, too,—and his reply was, “It will never reach either of them; the officials will take it all on the way.” That is what is going

on in Spain, just as it was when Gil Blas had his adventures. That is why Cuba has rebelled.

Mr. President, this long process of Spanish decay began far back, three hundred years ago, and the vast empire of Charles V has been dying through all these centuries. The men who first struck at it, even in its pitch of pride, were the men of the dikes and the marshes of Holland. The men who next struck it and brought it down were the men of English blood, the English seamen of the sixteenth century. They fought it by an instinct, because it stood for all that meant oppression, bigotry, cruelty, and terror. Those men of Holland and England fought it because they stood for the principles of liberty and of free government.

In our veins runs the blood of Holland and the blood of England. If after all the centuries it comes to us, much as we pray to avert it, to meet Spain face to face in war, it is because we are there in obedience to a greater movement than any man can hope to control. We are there because we represent the spirit of liberty and the spirit of the new time, and Spain is over against us because she is mediæval, cruel, dying. We are not there by chance. We are there because we stand now for just the same principles for which the men stood who followed William the Silent and sailed with Drake; and if this terrible thing—this awful curse of war—must come upon us, then we can only repeat with Lincoln the words of the second inaugural, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

Mr. President, we have exhausted the resources of diplomacy; we have made every effort that could be made. The President has been patient, more than patient. He has used every possible effort to secure a settlement at once honorable to the country and in the interest of free-

dom and humanity. Every effort that he has made has failed, and, so saying, he has committed the question to us.

We are told that Spain has recalled the concentration edict. We were told that last November, and yet the people have been in the pens dying ever since. We were told that Weyler's edict had been revoked then, and yet starvation has gone on. We hear of another proclamation for another revocation of that same edict which had been already revoked, and the people are dying in Havana now and in other towns, and the President himself concludes his message with a request for money to feed the starving.

What does the Spanish order of \$600,000 amount to? It is a fraud — an absolute fraud. It is a fraud like their armistice, which invites the insurgents to come in and lay down their arms. There is nothing in it at all but baffling snares, and every man who has been in the Island of Cuba and comes before the Committee on Foreign Relations swears to the same thing.

Mr. President, we cannot, in my opinion, allow that fire to burn longer at our doors. We can no longer permit those people to starve to death, brought to that hideous torture by a war measure of Spain. We cannot longer suffer our commerce to be ruined, our property destroyed, our business to be darkened and depressed. Spain has refused every valid suggestion that would bring any solution, and she has given us a stone where we have asked for bread.

We cannot accept, Mr. President, conditions of peace which would degrade us in the eyes of the world, and, what is infinitely more important, in our own eyes. If we were to do so, we should bring evils in the train of

such a yielding which no man can estimate. We should heap wars upon the generations yet unborn which no man can contemplate without a shudder, for we should give to the world an invitation to step into the Western Hemisphere and do anything they please to the people of the United States.

There are some things, Mr. President, horrible as war is, worse than war and better than money. A nation's honor is one thing, and her duty to humanity is another.

They say that they are not our own people. They are just outside the walls of the house we call our own. Ah, Mr. President, when they say to me, "Are you your brother's keeper?" I respond, "Yes; we are the keeper of those people in Cuba," for we announced fifty years ago to the whole world that the Cuban question was an American question. We drew a ring fence around that island, and we told the people of the earth that no one should interfere there except ourselves. Here we stand, shutting out every other nation and allowing Spain to butcher those people after her own fashion. There is a great responsibility. We cannot escape it, and if we fail to meet it we shall pay the awful price for our failure, as nations always do.

The sentiment of the American people in my judgment is for peace. We are essentially a peace-loving, peace-cherishing people. But there is a sentiment in the American people that is above and beyond their love of peace. I mean among the great mass of our people whose eyes are not blinded by the glitter of too much wealth. Among those people there is a strong sentiment for peace always, but it can only be peace with honor. They cherish very deeply the honor of their country all the more, perhaps, if they have not many other possessions to cherish,—the

pride in being an American is very dear to them, — and they do not want to see that name tarnished or brought to ignominy or dishonor.

The sentiment of my own State and my own people I have known, and know now, is for peace. They do not wish to see this country plunged into an unnecessary war, but neither would they see the country degraded. They would not see it dragged in the dust before the eyes of the world. If they cannot have peace with honor, then they will meet war in a brave and noble spirit, as Massachusetts always has met her trials, from Concord to Baltimore.

If war must be, — I hope and pray that it may yet be avoided, — no nation ever went to war on higher grounds or from nobler or more disinterested motives. War is here, if it is here, by the act of Spain. We have grasped no man's territory. We have taken no man's property. We have invaded no man's rights. We do not ask their lands. We do not ask their money. We ask peace in that unhappy island — peace and freedom, not for ourselves, but for others. It is an unselfish, a pure, a noble demand ; and if war does come, then, Mr. President, we do not fear to meet it. We will meet it so that the curse of Spain shall never rest again on any part of the Western Hemisphere. We do not want war ; we would do anything in honor to avoid it ; but if it must come, it will be a war that will prevent Spain from ever bringing misery, death, and ruin to Cuba, and agitation, unhappiness, loss, and war to the United States.

And now, Mr. President, what of the Maine ? I suppose a good argument can be made that that is a legal question ; that there are disputed facts ; that it does not do to get too excited about it ; but I am so sentimental, I am so merely

human, that that ship is nearer my heart than anything else. Suppose she had gone down to her death in an English harbor, blown up as she was, carrying her men with her ; what do you think would have been the voice of England — the land of Nelson? I believe if it had happened in an English port England would have said, in a great and generous spirit, "We regard this with horror ; we believe that it must have been an accident, but it happened in our harbor under our flag. If you think otherwise, name the reparation that you want." Such, Mr. President, I believe would have been the reply of England ; such I believe would have been our reply or that of any of the great Powers.

Look now at Spain. She has done nothing but slander the officers and sailors of the *Maine*, both the dead and the living. Her ambassador to Rome said but a week ago to all Europe, in a published interview, that that ship went down because her captain neglected her and was not on board. Notorious as the sinking of the ship is the fact that Captain Sigsbee was there, and that he was the last man to leave is equally well known, and yet the Spanish ambassador to Rome tells that lying story to the world. Last Sunday the Spanish ambassador in London announced also to all the world through the columns of the press that the *Maine* was blown up from inside because our officers neglected their duty, feasting on shore when they should have died at their posts. That is typical of the Spanish answer, and it is a coarse insult.

They agreed on their story that the ship was blown up by accident before they even looked at her hull. We have the evidence of Captain Sigsbee before our committee as to the character of the examination which the Spaniards made — trivial, slight, careless, done for a form, to

back up a story which they had already made up their minds to stand by and put forth. They have never even tried to prove that there were no mines in the harbor, and an accused man or nation who refuses to offer exculpatory evidence convicts himself. That has been the attitude of Spain — indifferent, insulting, ignoble — toward an awful disaster happening in her own harbor.

MR. FRYE. Mr. President —

THE VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Maine?

MR. LODGE. Certainly.

MR. FRYE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts please add right here that the death of our sailors and the destruction of our ship, according to General Lee's testimony, was celebrated with banquets and champagne by the Spanish officers in Cuba?

MR. LODGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for recalling to me the testimony of General Lee on that point yesterday. Where so much has been told it is impossible to remember all. They rejoiced in Havana, and they explained the explosion by throwing it upon our officers, slandering their character and denying their words.

I have examined that testimony from beginning to end; I have heard the evidence of Captain Sigsbee, of the torpedo experts of the Navy Department, and yesterday of the consul-general, Fitzhugh Lee. We know that that ship was anchored at a buoy never used for public ships of war, certainly not for many years; we know that she was anchored there by a Spanish official pilot; we know that the night she was blown up she had swung into a position where she had never ridden before, and the only position where her broadside commanded the fort; we have

the statement of General Lee and of Captain Sigsbee as to their profound belief ; we cannot put our hand upon the man who pressed the button, but we know that it was a submarine mine either put there for that special purpose or to defend the fortress, and Spain has never attempted to show that no mine was there.

On those unquestioned facts every man has the right to make up his own mind. Every man is entitled to his own belief, and I state mine after fifty days of careful study and a consideration of every fact. I have no more doubt than that I am now standing in the Senate of the United States — that that ship was blown up by a government mine, fired by, or with the connivance of, Spanish officials. I do not say it was done by General Blanco. I exonerate him fully on the statement of General Lee. I do not say that it was done by the government itself ; but it could have been done only by experts, only by men in control of government mines, only by men who had their hands upon the government machinery. Others may reason from those facts as they please. To me they bear but one interpretation, and that is that the *Maine* went to her death by Spanish treachery in the harbor of Havana, and Spaniards exulted and feasted when the black deed was done.

Mr. President, I suppose it may be urged that it is proper that we should negotiate and arbitrate ; but whenever I think of that solution there comes to my mind the lines of Lowell, written at another period, a very dark time in this country — written in the homely New England dialect : —

 Ef I turn mad dogs loose, John,
 On your front-parlor stairs,
Would it jest meet your views, John,
 To wait an' sue their heirs ?

Ah, Mr. President, it does not seem to me that this is a case for negotiation. It would have been the case for a generous opponent to have put himself greatly in the right by his treatment of it, but it seems to me we cannot any more negotiate about it than a man can negotiate about an insult to his mother. What could we take if we did arbitrate? Are we going to take money for those dead men of ours?

I suppose again that I am very impracticable and very sentimental, but the idea revolts me. At the close of the Civil War the great war governor of Massachusetts found his practice scattered, his small accumulations and savings gone, because he had given his time, as, indeed, he gave his life, to the service of the State and the country. It was known how much he had suffered in his practice and his purse, and there was a story circulated in the papers that his friends intended to make him collector of the port, the most highly paid office in the State of Massachusetts. The day that item of news appeared a friend of Governor Andrew met him and said to him, "Well, Governor, are you going to take the collectorship?" He paused a moment, then looked up suddenly and said, "I have stood for four years as high priest between the horns of the altar; I have poured out upon it the best blood of Massachusetts; I cannot take money for that."

Mr. President, we cannot take money for the dead men of the Maine. There is only one reparation. There is only one monument to raise over that grave, and that is free Cuba and peace in that island. That is a worthy monument, worthy of men who died under the flag they loved,—died, in the cold language of the law, "in the line of duty."

They say we cannot go to war about the Maine. Per-

haps not. We are told that it is an incident. So be it. It is the outgrowth of the conditions in Cuba ; it is the outgrowth of that Spanish rule ; it is the outcome of that Spanish war, and it calls upon us to end the causes that made it possible. The men who were hurled from the sleep of life into the sleep of death call upon us from their graves to root out forever the causes which made their slaughter possible.

We are told that we must not go to war on the narrow ground of revenge. Revenge is an ugly word, although Bacon tells us that it is nothing but wild justice. No, not revenge ; but we must have reparation for the Maine. We cannot as a nation belittle that case or refuse to demand a great and shining atonement for our dead sailors. If we allow that to drop aside, to pass away into an endless tangle of negotiation and law and discussion, we are lost to all sense of brotherhood ; we are lost to all love of kith and kin ; our uniform will no longer be an honor and a protection ; it will be a disgrace and danger to wear it.

Your men on your ships are sullen to-day because they think that the government is not behind them. There are mutterings among the men who wear your uniform because they think you have not striven to redress the awful slaughter of their comrades. You must maintain the honor of the uniform and of the flag under which the men died. Surely, there never was a more righteous cause than this for any nation to ask for justice. That gigantic murder, the last spasm of a corrupt and dying society, which carried down our ship and our men, cries aloud for justice.

Mr. President, I care but little what form of words we adopt. I am ready to yield my opinions to those about me

in Congress. Still more ready am I to defer to the wishes of the Executive, who stands and must stand at our head ; but I want now to arm that Executive with powers which shall enable him to bring peace to Cuba and secure exact justice for the Maine.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE, MARCH 7, 1900.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection and to the government of the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, reported from the Committee on the Philippines, as follows :—

“ Be it enacted, etc., That when all insurrection against the sovereignty and authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.”

MR. LODGE. This bill, Mr. President, is simple but all-sufficient. It makes no declarations and offers no promises as to a future we cannot yet predict. It meets the need of the present, and stops there. The President, under the military power, which still controls and must for some time control the islands, could do all that this bill provides. But it is well that he should have the direct authorization of Congress and be enabled to meet any emergency that may arise with the sanction of the law-making power, until that power shall decree otherwise. Above all, it is important that Congress should assert its authority; that we should

not leave the Executive, acting with the unlimited authority of the war power, to go on alone after the conclusion of peace, but that he should proceed under the authority of Congress in whatever he does until Congress shall otherwise and more specifically provide. By this bill we follow the well-settled American precedents of Jefferson and Monroe, which were used still later in the case of Hawaii. To leave the war power unrestrained after the end of war, as was done in the case of California and New Mexico, is to abdicate our own authority. This bill is the assertion of congressional authority and of the legislative power of the government. To undertake any further or more far-reaching legislation at this time would be, in my judgment, a great mistake. But I believe it to be of the first importance to define our position, so that it may be perfectly understood by the inhabitants of the Philippines, as well as by our own people.

Negotiations, concessions, promises, and hesitations are to the Asiatic mind merely proofs of weakness, and tend only to encourage useless outbreaks, crimes, and disorders. A firm attitude, at once just and fearless, impresses such people with a sense of strength, and will calm them, give them a feeling of security, and tend strongly to bring about peace and good order. This bill conveys this impression, states the present position of the United States, and does nothing more. The operative and essential part of it is in the very words of the act by which Congress authorized Jefferson to govern Louisiana, and which received his approbation and signature. It was also used by Congress and by President Monroe in 1819 in regard to Florida. I think that in such a case we may safely tread in the footsteps of the author of the Declaration of Independence. He saw no contradiction between that great

instrument and the treaty with Napoleon, or the act to govern Louisiana. Some modern commentators take a different view, and are unable to reconcile the acquisition of territory without what they call the consent of the governed with the principles of the Declaration. Jefferson found no such difficulty, and I cannot but think that he understood the meaning of the Declaration as well as its latest champions and defenders. At all events, I am content to follow him, content to vote for his bill, content to accept his interpretation of what he himself wrote. Even if he is wrong, those of us who agree with him can console ourselves by thinking that it is perhaps "better to err with Pope than shine with Pye."

The questions involved in the future management of these islands and in our policy in the far East are of a nature to demand the highest and the most sagacious statesmanship. I have always thought with Webster that party politics should cease "at the water's edge." He spoke only in reference to our relations with foreign nations, but I think we might well apply his patriotic principle to our dealings with our own insular possessions, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific. The Philippines should be an American question, not the sport of parties or the subject of party creeds. The responsibility for them rests upon the American people, not upon the Democratic or Republican party. If we fail in dealing with them, we shall all alike suffer from the failure; and if we succeed, the honor and the profit will redound in the end to the glory and the benefit of all. This view, no doubt, seems visionary. It certainly ought not to be so, and in time I believe it will be accepted. Unfortunately it is not the case to-day.

One of the great political parties of the country has

seen fit to make what is called "an issue" of the Philippines. They have no alternative policy to propose which does not fall to pieces as soon as it is stated. A large and important part of their membership, North and South, is heartily in favor of expansion, because they are Americans, and have not only patriotism, but an intelligent perception of their own interests. They are the traditional party of expansion, the party which first went beyond seas and tried to annex Hawaii, which plotted for years to annex Cuba, which have in our past acquisitions of territory their one great and enduring monument. In their new wanderings they have developed a highly commendable, if somewhat hysterical, tenderness for the rights of men with dark skins dwelling in the islands of the Pacific, in pleasing contrast to the harsh indifference which they have always manifested toward those American citizens who "wear the shadowed livery of the burnished sun" within the boundaries of the United States. The Democratic party has for years been the advocate of free trade and increased exports, but now they shudder at our gaining control of the Pacific and developing our commerce with the East. Ready, in their opposition to protection, to open our markets to the free competition of all the tropical, all the cheapest labor of the world, they are now filled with horror at the thought of admitting to our markets that small fragment of the world's cheap labor contained in the Philippine Islands, something which neither Republicans nor any one else think for one moment of doing. Heedless of their past and of their best traditions, careless of their inconsistencies, utterly regardless of the obvious commercial interests of the South, which they control; totally indifferent to the wishes and beliefs of a large portion of their membership, and to the advice and example

of some of their most patriotic, most loyal, and most courageous leaders, to whom all honor is due, the managers of the Democratic organization have decided to oppose the retention of the Philippines and our policy of trade expansion in the East, for which those islands supply the corner stone. Their reason appears to be the highly sagacious one that it is always wise to oppose whatever Republicans advocate, without regard to the merits of the policy or to the circumstances which gave it birth. I will make no comment upon this theory of political action, except to say that it has seemed for a long time exceedingly congenial to the intelligence of the Democratic party, and that it may perhaps account for the fact that since 1860 they have only held for eight years a brief and ineffective power. As an American I regret that our opponents should insist on making a party question of this new and far-reaching problem, so fraught with great promise of good both to ourselves and to others. As a party man and as a Republican I can only rejoice. Once more our opponents insist that we shall be the only political party devoted to American policies. As the standard of expansion, once so strongly held by their great predecessors, drops from their nerveless hands, we take it up and invite the American people to march with it. We offer our policy to the American people, to Democrats and to Republicans, as an American policy, alike in duty and honor, in morals and in interest, as one not of skepticism and doubt, but of hope and faith in ourselves and in the future, as becomes a great young nation which has not yet learned to use the art of retreat or to speak with the accents of despair. In 1804 the party which opposed expansion went down in utter wreck before the man who, interpreting aright the instincts, the hopes, and the spirit of the American people,

made the Louisiana purchase. We make the same appeal in behalf of our American policies. We have made the appeal before, and won, as we deserved to win. We shall not fail now.

Before explaining our policy I should be glad, as a preliminary, to state the policy proposed by our opponents, so that I could contrast our own with it; but I have thus far been unable to discover what their policy is. No doubt it exists, no doubt it is beautiful, but, like many beautiful things, it seems to the average searcher after truth both diaphanous and elusive. We have had presented to us, it is true, the policy desired by Aguinaldo and his followers,—that we should acknowledge him as a government, enforce his rule upon the other eighty-three tribes and upon all the other islands, and then protect him from foreign interference. This plan, which would involve us in endless wars with the natives and keep us embroiled with other nations, loads us with responsibility without power, and falls into ruin and absurdity the moment it is stated. Another proposition is that we should treat the Philippines as we treat Cuba. That is precisely what we are doing. But what is really meant by this demand is not that we should treat the Philippines as we treat Cuba, but that we should make to them a promise as to the future. And that is what every proposition made by those opposed to the Republican party comes down to, a promise as to the future. We are to put down insurrection and disorder and hold the islands temporarily without the consent of the governed, but simultaneously we are to make large promises as to the future which will look well in print and keep insurrection and disorder alive.

The resolutions offered by Senators on the other side and the tenor of their speeches are all of this description.

They present no policy, but invite us to make promises. Promises are neither action nor policy, and, in the form of legislation, are a grave mistake. Those which involve us in pledges of independence have the additional disadvantage of being the one sure means of keeping alive war and disorder in the islands. Those who offer them or urge them proceed on the assumption that you can deal with an Asiatic in the same manner, and expect from him the same results, as from a European or an American. This shows, it seems to me, a fatal misconception. The Asiatic mind and habit of thought are utterly different from ours. Words or acts which to us would show generosity and kindness and would bring peace and order, to an Asiatic mean simply weakness and timidity, and are to him an incentive to riot, resistance, and bloodshed. Promises of this kind, therefore, are neither effective action nor intelligent policy, but the sure breeders of war. If we must abandon the Philippines, let us abandon them frankly. If we mean to turn them over to domestic anarchy or foreign control, let us do it squarely. If we are to retain them, let us deal manfully with the problems as they arise. But do not indulge in the unspeakable cruelty of making promises which our successors may be unable or unwilling to fulfill, and which will serve merely to light the flames of war once more and bring death to hundreds of natives and to scores of American soldiers. Let us not attempt in such a situation and with such responsibilities to mortgage an unknown future and give bonds to fate which will be redeemed in blood.

The policy we offer, on the other hand, is simple and straightforward. We believe in the frank acceptance of existing facts, and in dealing with them as they are, and not on a theory of what they might or ought to be. We

accept the fact that the Philippine Islands are ours to-day and that we are responsible for them before the world. The next fact is that there is a war in those islands, which, with its chief in hiding, and no semblance of a government, has now degenerated into mere guerrilla fighting and brigandage, with a precarious existence predicated on the November elections. Our immediate duty, therefore, is to suppress this disorder, put an end to fighting, and restore peace and order. That is what we are doing. That is all we are called upon to do in order to meet the demands of the living present. Beyond this we ought not to go by a legislative act, except to make such provision that there may be no delay in reëstablishing civil government when the war ends. The question of our constitutional right and power to govern those islands in any way we please I shall not discuss. Not only is it still in the future, but if authority is lacking, the Constitution can be amended. Personally I have no doubt that our Constitution gives full right and authority to hold and govern the Philippines without making them either economically or politically part of our system, neither of which they should ever be. When our great Chief Justice, John Marshall—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—declared in the Cherokee case that the United States could have under its control, exercised by treaty or the laws of Congress, a “domestic and dependent nation,” I think he solved the question of our constitutional relations to the Philippines. Further than the acts and the policy which I have just stated, I can only give my own opinion and belief as to the future, and as to the course to be pursued in the Philippines. I hope and believe that we shall retain the islands, and that, peace and order once restored, we shall and should reëstablish civil government, beginning with

the towns and villages, where the inhabitants are able to manage their own affairs. We should give them honest administration, and prompt and efficient courts. We should see to it that there is entire protection to persons and property, in order to encourage the development of the islands by the assurance of safety to investors of capital. All men should be protected in the free exercise of their religion, and the doors thrown open to missionaries of all Christian sects. The land, which belongs to the people, and of which they have been robbed in the past, should be returned to them and their titles made secure. We should inaugurate and carry forward, in the most earnest and liberal way, a comprehensive system of popular education. Finally, while we bring prosperity to the islands by developing their resources, we should, as rapidly as conditions will permit, bestow upon them self-government and home rule. Such, in outline, is the policy which I believe can be and will be pursued toward the Philippines. It will require time, patience, honesty, and ability for its completion, but it is thoroughly practicable and reasonable.

The foundation of it all is the retention of the islands by the United States, and it is to that question that I desire to address myself. I shall not argue our title to the islands by the law of nations, for it is perfect. No other nation has ever questioned it. It is too plain a proposition to warrant the waste of time and words upon it. Equally plain is our right under the Constitution, by a treaty which is the supreme law of the land, to hold those islands. I will not argue this point, nor the entire legality of all that the President has done in accordance with his constitutional power and with the law passed by Congress at the last session, which recognized the necessity of an increased

army in order to cope with the existing insurrection. The opposition to the Republican policy rests its weight on grounds widely different from these. They assert that on moral grounds we have no right to take or retain the Philippines, and that as a matter of expediency our whole Eastern policy is a costly mistake. I traverse both assertions. I deny both propositions. I believe we are in the Philippines as righteously as we are there rightfully and legally. I believe that to abandon the islands, or to leave them now, would be a wrong to humanity, a dereliction of duty, a base betrayal of the Filipinos who have supported us, led by the best men of Luzon, and in the highest degree contrary to sound morals. As to expediency, the arguments in favor of the retention of the Philippines seem to me so overwhelming that I should regard their loss as a calamity to our trade and commerce and to all our business interests so great that no man can measure it. Let me take these propositions in their order, beginning with the question of right and wrong, of morals and duty, involved in our action.

Our opponents put forward as their chief objection that we have robbed these people of their liberty, and have taken them and hold them in defiance of the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence in regard to the consent of the governed. As to liberty, they have never had it, and have none now, except when we give it to them protected by the flag and the armies of the United States. Their insurrection against Spain, confined to one island, had been utterly abortive, and could never have revived or been successful while Spain controlled the sea. We have given them all the liberty they ever had. We could not have robbed them of it, for they had none to lose.

The second objection, as to the consent of the governed,

requires more careful examination, because of the persistency with which it has been made the subject of heated declamation. I cannot hope to rival the eloquence and the oratory which have been devoted to this point, but I shall try to make a plain and simple statement in regard to it, lighted on my way by the facts of history, and if not, like so many of our opponents, a master of rhetoric, at least I shall go forward undazzled by its deceptive radiance. It has been stated over and over again that we have done great wrong in taking these islands without the consent of the governed, from which, according to American principles, all just government derives its powers. The consent of the governed! It is a fair phrase and runs trippingly upon the tongue, but I have observed a great lack of definite meaning in those who use it most. I have always thought it well in discussing any subject to know, as a preliminary, precisely what we mean by a word or a phrase. What do we mean by the "consent of the governed?" We quote it from the Declaration of Independence. What did Jefferson mean by the phrase? Some persons say that he meant the consent of all the governed. Others that he meant the consent of some of the governed. Sentiment seems to be with the former interpretation of Jefferson's language; the facts appear to be with the latter. But neither "all" nor "some" are in Jefferson's famous sentence. Nor is there any indication of how the consent is to be obtained or expressed, although the present especial guardians of the Declaration seem to assume that it must be by a vote.

In order to interpret Jefferson's language aright, let us see what kind of a government he was himself engaged in setting up, for there alone can we get light as to his meaning. The Declaration of Independence was the announce-

ment of the existence of a new revolutionary government upon American soil. Upon whose consent did it rest? Was it upon that of all the people of the colonies duly expressed? Most assuredly not. In the first place, we must throw out all negroes and persons of African descent, who formed about one quarter of the population, and who were not consulted at all as to the proposed change of government. So we must immediately insert the word "white" in Jefferson's sentence. Let us go a step further. Were women included in the word "governed"? They certainly were not permitted by voice or vote to express an opinion on this momentous question. They must, therefore, be excluded, and we must add to the word "white" the word "male" as a further limitation upon the governed whom Jefferson had in mind. Did the revolutionary government rest on the consent of all the white males in the colonies? Most assuredly not. There was the usual age limitation which shut out all the male persons under twenty-one, and manhood suffrage, as we understand it, did not exist in a single colony. Everywhere the suffrage was limited, generally by property qualifications, sometimes by other restrictions. So another amendment becomes necessary to Jefferson's phrase if we are going to make it fit the government which he was actually engaged in setting up. Conforming to the facts, the sentence then would read something like this: "Deriving their just powers from the consent of the white male governed who have the right to vote according to the laws of the various colonies." This is not all. The white male population of voting and military age in the colonies was divided upon the question of the Revolution. In some states the Loyalists were in a majority; in others the Patriots were in a majority; and in still others the two parties

appear to have been pretty evenly balanced. Taking the colonies as a whole, a very large minority, if not quite half, of the people whom the Continental Congress proposed to govern were utterly opposed to the Revolution. Did we ask their consent? Not at all. We crowded the revolutionary government on the Loyalists at the point of the bayonet, and when the Revolution was over they had to accept the government thus forced upon them or go into exile, which many of them did. Therefore, if we test Jefferson's phrase by the facts of the government which we see he himself was engaged in setting up, we find that it does not in the least meet the fantastic extensions which it has been sought to put upon it in the interests of the Filipinos.

The truth is that those were the days of Rousseau and his theories, and the doctrines of the social compact were strong in their influence upon all the political thought of the time. We can trace, I think, Jefferson's aphorism to this source. What Jefferson really did — with Rousseau and the theory of the social compact in mind — was to put in the form of a large generalization the principle for which the colonies engaged in the Revolution, which was that they were not to be taxed without representation and without their consent. He was not drafting a law or a constitution providing for all contingencies and setting up all sorts of limitations. If he had done that, no one would have heeded his Declaration at the moment, much less read and repeated it since. Jefferson was saying to all the world what the American people, whom he represented, felt, and what he himself believed. To do this he set forth a series of general principles in broad and brilliant terms, so that the whole world listened then, and the American people have repeated his sentences from that

day to this. He would have been the first to deny the narrow, rigid interpretation which, in the exigencies of debate, men have sought to place upon his words. But we are not at a loss to know what Jefferson himself thought. He was the greatest expansionist in our history. He acquired a vast territory for the United States. Did he ask the consent of the thirty thousand white men at the mouth of the Mississippi, or of the Indians roaming over the wide expanses of the Louisiana Purchase? Such an idea never occurred to him for one moment. He took Louisiana without the consent of the governed, and he ruled it without the consent of the governed. It was not a question then of "all" or "some." He never asked the consent of any of the governed, either to take the territory or to rule it afterwards.

But it is not necessary to stretch Jefferson's phrase embodying a general principle in which we all believe on the Procrustean bed of facts. As the Frenchman said, "No generalization is completely true, not even this one." To pull a sentence out of a revolutionary manifesto and deal with it as if it was one of the labored and chiseled clauses of the Constitution shows a sad confusion of thought. Neither Thomas Jefferson nor any other sensible man supposed for one moment that it was possible to have a government rest on the expressed consent of all the governed. No such government has ever existed, or ever can exist; and yet the governments of the United States and of the several states of the Union rest to-day firmly and absolutely upon the consent of the governed. Take my own State of Massachusetts. The total population of the State is, in round numbers, 2,500,000. The total number of registered voters for the state election of 1899 was 490,483. The other 2,000,000 inhabitants of

Massachusetts, men, women, and children, had neither the right nor the power in any way to express their consent to the government of the State. The people who had the right to rule this State were a little less than one fifth of the population, and of those people 297,000 only exercised the privilege last November. Of the two million and a half people resident in Massachusetts, less than three hundred thousand have expressed their consent to the government which to-day rules over them. Yet the government of Massachusetts rests on the consent of the governed, if any government of the world ever did; and we know it, not from the number of voters who vote, but from the fact that the entire population acquiesce in the form of government under which a majority of a small minority of the people rule the State. In other words, the consent of the governed is not to be determined by votes alone, nor their dissent by the riot, insurrection, or disorder of a fraction of the population. The plebiscites which supported the third Napoleon on his throne did not represent the consent of the people of France, and yet they were large and nearly unanimous. While, on the other hand, the closely divided vote of our last general election supplies in its result, which all men accept, the firm foundation upon which the Government of the United States to-day rests with the consent of all the governed. From this it follows that the consent of the governed is a phrase which represents a great and just principle, but which in practice must have its existence determined by actual facts and conditions, and is not to be ascertained merely by voting or in any other one way.

But this is not all. We must go a step farther and see how the American people throughout their history have applied this principle to the vast territory which they have

acquired. We have an immediate interpretation of the declaration in the secret treaty made with France at the time of the treaty of alliance in 1778. In that treaty occurs the following article : —

If the United States should think fit to attempt the reduction of British power remaining in the northern parts of America, or the Islands of Bermudas, those countries or islands, in case of success, shall be confederated with or dependent upon the said United States.

It will be observed that this clause provides for the acquisition of inhabited territory by conquest, and asserts the right of the United States to govern the territory so conquered as a dependency of the United States, if it sees fit. I find nothing in it about the consent of the governed, yet that treaty clause was drawn by Benjamin Franklin, who was on the committee which drafted the Declaration of Independence, and to whom it was submitted for amendment and correction. I cannot but feel that Franklin knew what the Declaration meant, and that he saw no inconsistency with it in writing the clause of the treaty which I have quoted and which the circumstances of the time demanded.

Hard upon this first practical interpretation of the Declaration of Independence came our first extension of territory, through the conquest of the Illinois country by George Rogers Clark. That brilliant feat of arms carried our boundaries to the Mississippi on the west and to the Great Lakes on the north. But I never heard that we asked the consent of the French inhabitants of that region, which had been wrested from France by England, to our government, when by the right of conquest they were ceded to us under the treaty of Paris.

The next, and the greatest of all our expansions, was the Louisiana purchase. There is no word in the treaty about the consent of the governed, nor in the resolutions of Congress which gave Jefferson the power to rule over that vast region, nor in the act organizing the territorial government, which was to be the creation of the executive power. Yet there were thirty thousand white men settled at the mouth of the Mississippi and in its neighborhood, who had no good-will to this government, and whose wishes were never consulted at all by the nations which decided their fate. Are we to be told that this differs from the case of the Filipinos because the inhabitants of Louisiana were few and the territory was vast and sparsely populated? I have heard such an argument advanced, incredible as it may seem, and I can only reply to it by asking if the consent of the governed rests upon the number of the people involved? If so, at what point in the census does this great doctrine begin to take effect? I confess, Mr. President, that my principles in regard to the rights of man are not quite so flexible as that. The doctrine of the consent of the governed is just as sacred for one man as for ten, for thirty thousand as for ten million. To say that it is modified or determined by land areas or census statistics is as apposite as to declare that it is controlled by the abundance of springs or the paucity of trees. Such a proposition is fit to go hand in hand with that other which I find in resolutions and speeches here, to the effect that it is permissible to rule without the consent of the governed if you will promise to do it only for a little while. No, Mr. President, if the consent of the governed is a rigid and immutable principle, no casuistry of this sort can make it at once absolute and open to modification. It is either subject to the laws of common sense in its applica-

tion or it is fixed and unchangeable. It cannot be both at once. Jefferson's mind was certainly free from all such confusions. He did not attempt to rest his acquisition and government of Louisiana without the consent of the governed on any such grounds as the numbers of the population or the size of the territory. He put it on the real ground, that of truth and common sense, for in 1803 he wrote to De Witt Clinton:—

Although it is acknowledged that our new fellow citizens are as yet incapable of self-government as children, yet some cannot bring themselves to suspend its principles for a single moment.¹

Thus, then, under the guidance of Thomas Jefferson, and with a Congress obedient to his slightest behest, we took Louisiana without the consent of the governed, and ruled it without their consent so long as we saw fit. Who is there to-day who will stand up and say that Thomas Jefferson did not do well and rightly when he bought Louisiana?

A few years more passed, and, in 1819, we bought Florida from Spain without the consent of the governed, and this crime against the Declaration of Independence was perpetrated by John Quincy Adams and James Monroe. Moreover, Congress placed in the hands of President Monroe, who was the principal criminal, power to govern this new territory absolutely, in the very terms employed by a previous Congress when they conferred a like authority upon Thomas Jefferson.

The next case is Texas. There we had technically the

¹ Extract of a letter from Thomas Jefferson to De Witt Clinton, dated at Washington, December 2, 1803. — *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Paul Leicester Ford, p. 283.

consent of the governed, but it so happened that those who ruled Texas were Americans. They had gone into that region, settled the country, and conquered it in war from Mexico. Having done that, they decided to rejoin their own country, bringing their conquered territory with them. The way was a little more roundabout, but the result was the same as if the Government of the United States had conquered Texas for itself. I never have been able to discover any indication that the Mexicans who lived in that great region had their consent asked, and I have a very strong impression that the rule of the American invaders was forced upon such persons as happened to be there before their arrival, without regard to the latter's wishes.

Then came the Mexican war, and by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo we received a great cession of territory from Mexico, including all the California coast; and although we paid Mexico twenty millions as indemnity, I think it has been held that the cession was one of conquest. There were many Mexicans living within the ceded territory. We never asked their consent. Must we again draw the census line, and say that the country was too large and they were too few to be entitled to a consent? There seems to be no other escape, if it is desired to distinguish the California acquisition from that of the Philippines. I need not dwell upon the Gadsden purchase which followed in 1852, except to say that under its provisions we bought territory with the people on it from Mexico, and nobody was consulted except the governments of Mexico and of the United States.

The consent of the governed appears next in a question which involved, not the expansion of the United States, but the retention of a large part of its existing domain.

In 1861 eleven states of the Union decided to leave it. With the profoundest faith in the justice of their cause, with the utmost bravery and the highest military skill, they fought their battle for four long years. What was the reply of the people of the United States to the proposition of the eleven seceding states? Simply this, "You shall not go"; and the people of the United States, with the profoundest faith in the justice of their cause, and with bravery and skill quite equal to that of their Southern brethren, fought for their belief for four years, and won. We forced the Southern States back into the Union, and will any one tell me that we asked the consent of the governed? I have heard it said that this was a case to which the consent of the governed could not apply, because it was rebellion against the will of the majority, which we had all agreed to obey. Even this poor quibble will not serve. The great President, one of the greatest men of the century now dying, who led his country through those awful years, and who finally laid down his life in her behalf, was elected President in 1860 by a minority of the popular vote. No, Mr. President, the existence of the Union was at stake in the Civil War, and all questions about the consent of the governed went down into nothingness, as they deserved to go, in the presence of that master issue.

One more case, and I have done with the list of expansions. In 1867 we purchased Alaska from Russia,—territory, people, and all. Let me call attention to article three. It is there said that—

The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes,

shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may from time to time adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country.

It will be observed that to the white inhabitants we allow the liberty of returning to Russia, but we except the uncivilized tribes specifically. They are to be governed without their consent, and they are not even to be allowed to become citizens. Why, only the other day, Mr. President, a great Democratic thinker announced that a republic could have no subjects. He seems to have forgotten that this republic not only has held subjects from the beginning, in the persons of those whom we euphemistically call the "wards of the nation," but that, to our shame be it said, we once authorized the slave trade in our Constitution, and provided for fugitive slave laws. More than this, if he had been familiar with the Alaskan treaty, he would have known that we not only hold subjects, but have acquired them by purchase. This Alaskan treaty passed without serious opposition, and when the appropriation to carry it out went through the House, the House added to the bill a specific approval of the treaty. This infringement of the constitutional right of the Senate was stricken out when it reached the treaty-making branch, but it is of interest because the House in voting for it gave formal approval to the treaty provisions. They approved of the provision which transferred the inhabitants without their consent to the jurisdiction of the United States, and which denied to the Indian tribes even the right to choose their allegiance, or to become citizens. It interested me to notice, although the point is a very unimportant one, that

among those who in the House approved this vast acquisition of territory without the consent of the governed, and with the careful exclusion of the Indians from all rights, was my eminent fellow citizen, ex-Governor Boutwell.

Prophets of evil are not lacking to declare ruin inevitable if we persist in our career of expansion and in setting no fixed bounds to the progress of the country. Like the raven of Macbeth, they croak themselves hoarse in predicting the downfall of the republic. These dire forebodings are not new. Look back to the debates of 1803 and the succeeding years, and you will find there all that is being said now in almost the same language, and with the same certainty of swift-coming disaster. In view of the results of the Louisiana Purchase, the gloomy prophecies of these old Cassandras look very queer and make us smile. But they are no queerer than the black predictions of their successors of to-day will appear to the next generation. The downfall of the republic has been constantly and confidently foretold many times since the foundation of the government, generally on trivial grounds, and always when a great expansion of territory took place. Never has it come true. Only once was the great peril real and near, and that was not when men were trying to widen the bounds of the republic, but when they sought to divide it and make it small.

Thus, Mr. President, I have reviewed our former acquisitions of territory. The record of American expansions which closes with Alaska has been a long one, and to-day we do but continue the same movement. The same policy runs through them all, — the same general acceptance of the laws of nations in regard to the transfer of territory, the same absence of any reference to the consent of the

governed. It has not only been the American policy, it is the only policy practicable in such transactions. Why should we now be suddenly confronted with the objection that it is a crime to acquire the territories ceded to us by Spain in 1898, when we cheerfully accept all the previous cessions, which do not differ one whit in principle from the last? If the arguments which have been offered against our taking the Philippine Islands because we have not the consent of the inhabitants be just, then our whole past record of expansion is a crime, and Thomas Jefferson, and John Quincy Adams, and James Monroe, and all the rest of our Presidents and statesmen who have added to our national domain are traitors to the cause of liberty and to the Declaration of Independence. Does any one really believe it? I think not. Then let us be honest and look at this whole question as it really is. I am not ashamed of that long record of American expansion. I am proud of it. I do not think that we violated in that record the principles of the Declaration of Independence. On the contrary, I think we spread them over regions where they were unknown. Guided by the principles of that record, I am proud of the treaty of Paris, which is but a continuance of our American policy. The taking of the Philippines does not violate the principles of the Declaration of Independence, but will spread them among a people who have never known liberty, and who in a few years will be as unwilling to leave the shelter of the American flag as those of any other territory we ever brought beneath its folds.

The next argument of the opponents of the Republican policy is that we are denying self-government to the Filipinos. Our reply is that to give independent self-government at once, as we understand it, to a people who have

no just conception of it and no fitness for it, is to dower them with a curse instead of a blessing. To do this would be entirely to arrest their progress, instead of advancing them on the road to the liberty and free government which we wish them to achieve and enjoy. This contention rests, of course, on the proposition that the Filipinos are not to-day in the least fitted for self-government, as we understand it. The argument on this point is, I will admit, much simplified by the admissions of our opponents. The past, present, and prospective leader and Presidential candidate of the Democratic party said at Minneapolis, on January 10 : —

I am a firm believer in the enlargement and extension of the limits of the republic. I don't mean by that the extension by the addition of contiguous territory, nor to limit myself to that.

Wherever there is a people intelligent enough to form a part of this republic, it is my belief that they should be taken in. Wherever there is a people who are capable of having a voice and a representation in this government, there the limits of the republic may be extended.

The Filipinos are not such a people. The Democratic party has ever favored the extension of the limits of this republic ; but it has never advocated the acquisition of subject territory to be held under colonial government.

I do not assert that this is his view to-day, for Mr. Bryan gives forth a great variety of opinions on a great variety of topics. I have not, unfortunately, either time or opportunity to indulge in the delight of reading all he says ; for even if he does not from night to night show knowledge, he certainly from day to day uttereth speech. The passage that I have quoted seems, however, to be the last authentic deliverance on the subject, and in it Mr. Bryan distinctly admits that the Filipinos are unfit for

self-government, as we understand it. What is far more important and to the purpose, the Senator from Washington, in the able and interesting speech which he delivered on this subject, has made the same admission. Thus our differences narrow. They think that we should abandon the Philippines because they are not fit for self-government. I believe that for that very reason we should retain them, and lead them along the path of freedom until they are able to be self-governing, so far, at least, as all their own affairs are concerned. I should be glad to let the matter rest here and confine myself to this very narrow ground of difference; but, unfortunately, there are people who do not recognize facts so frankly as the Senator to whom I have referred, and who contend either that the Filipinos are fit for self-government in the highest acceptation of the term, or that it is our duty to withdraw and leave them to set up such a government as they can evolve for themselves.

I do not think the Filipinos are fit for self-government as we understand it, and I am certain that if we left them alone the result would be disastrous to them and discreditable to us. Left to themselves the islands, if history, facts, and experience teach anything, would sink into a great group of Haitis and St. Domingos, with this important difference, that there would be no Monroe Doctrine to prevent other nations from interfering to put an end to the ruin of the people and the conversion of a fair land into a useless and unproductive waste. The nations of Europe are not going to stand idly by and see the islands of the Philippines given over to anarchy and dictatorships of the Haitian type, while their waters swarm again with pirates whom Spain suppressed, and whom we have now the responsibility of keeping down and extinguishing.

We have no right to give those islands up to anarchy, tyrannies, and piracy, and I hope we have too much self-respect to hand them over to European powers, with the confession that they can restore peace and order more kindly and justly than we, and lead the inhabitants onward to a larger liberty and a more complete self-government than we can bestow upon them. Therefore, Mr. President, I desire to show why I feel so confident that the Filipinos are not now fit for self-government, and that their only hope of reaching the freedom, self-government, and civilization which we desire them to have, lies in our now holding, governing, and controlling the islands.

Let us look first for a moment at the new territory of which we have thus become the possessors. The Philippine group extends over a distance of one thousand miles north and south. The large-scale maps show that it consists of 1725 islands, great and small. Of these, at least sixty are over twenty miles square. Geographically, therefore, it is a broken and separated territory, scattered over a wide extent of ocean. It is physically without unity or connection. The best statistics — and the best are poor — indicate that there is a population on all the islands of over eight million. This population consists of different races, of many tribes, — President Schurman and Professor Worcester say that there are eighty-four, — speaking fifty or sixty languages and dialects. Most of these people are of the Malay stock, but in many of the tribes the Malay blood is greatly mixed. One division consists of the Negritos, few in number, and steadily declining, who are ethnically totally different from the Malays, largely savage wanderers in the mountainous and wooded interiors of the islands, and who are in the lowest stage of barbarism. They are racially as different from the Malays as we are.

Another, and a large division, consists of people of what is sometimes called the Indonesian stock, who are physically a finer race than the Malays, but who are still entirely uncivilized, and who are pagans in religion. There are also in the interior many wild and barbarous Malay tribes, with no conception of government whatever, except in the case of certain of them like the Macabebes, who have one fixed political idea, which is that they will fight the Tagals to the death and will unite with any one against them. The Malay tribes are almost as widely divided among themselves as from the Negritos. Those of the Sulu Archipelago and Mindanao are Mohammedans, and bitter foes of the Christianized Malays of Luzon; and among the Christianized Malays some are as hostile to the Tagals as they are to the Moros, while the wild tribes, or "Infieles," are hostile to both. The islands fell an easy prey to the Spanish conquerors, because there was no unity among them. They were occupied by detached tribes living under the despotism of local chiefs. There was no consolidation, no unity, even among the inhabitants of a single island. The Filipinos have never been either a people or a nation. There has never been any single sovereignty there, or any central government, except that of Spain, to which we succeeded. To accept the Tagal followers of Aguinaldo as representing the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands would be just as intelligent as to hold that because William Penn made a treaty with the Delawares we thereby bound, and were bound to, the Sioux, Pawnees, and Apaches, who roamed over the great plains of the West. There has never been a Filipino nation; there has never been a Filipino government; there is not a scintilla of evidence that at any period they had any central government whatever or were capable of having any form

of government, larger than a village community, which was not an unrestrained Asiatic despotism, whether exercised by a sultan in the Mohammedan regions or by some military dictator of like political instincts among those who had come under the rule and example of Spain. Of self-government, as we understand it or as it is understood by Western civilization, there has never been the faintest conception in the Philippine Islands, and there never will be unless we give them the opportunity, and by slow processes teach them what it is. Geographically and ethnically — because they are scattered islands, and because the people are divided among eighty-four tribes in all stages of development, from savagery to civilization, speaking fifty or sixty different dialects or languages, with every form of religion — they are to-day not only unfit for self-government, but from the physical facts alone self-government is impossible to the Philippines as a whole. There must be one central, strong, civilized power which shall control all the islands, and thus give them in the only possible way the opportunity of rising to freedom and home rule.

The capacity of a people, moreover, for free and representative government is not in the least a matter of guesswork. The forms of government to which nations or races naturally tend may easily be discovered from history. You can follow the story of political freedom and representative government among the English-speaking people back across the centuries, until you reach the Teutonic tribes emerging from the forests of Germany and bringing with them forms of local self-government which are repeated to-day in the pure democracies of the New England town-meeting. The tendencies and instincts of the Teutonic race which, reaching from the Arctic Circle to the

Alps, swept down upon the Roman Empire, were clear at the outset. Yet the individual freedom and the highly developed forms of free government, in which these tendencies and instincts have culminated in certain countries and under the most favorable conditions, have been the slow growth of nearly fifteen hundred years.

There never has been, on the other hand, the slightest indication of any desire for what we call freedom or representative government east of Constantinople. The battle of Marathon was but the struggle between a race which had the instinct and desire for freedom and the opposite principle. The form of government natural to the Asiatic has always been a despotism. You may search the history of Asia and of the East for the slightest trace, not merely of any understanding, but of any desire for political liberty, as we understand the word. In the village communities of India, in the Mura of Japan, in the towns and villages of China, you can find forms of local self-government which are as successful as they are ancient. The Malays of Java and of the Philippines as well display the same capacity, and on this old and deep-rooted practice the self-government of provinces and states can, under proper auspices, be built up. It is just here that our work ought to begin. But this local self-government never went beyond the town or the village; it never grew and spread, as was the case with the Teutonic tribes and their descendants. The only central, state, or national governments which the Eastern and Asiatic people have formed or set up have been invariably despotisms. They may have been tempered by assassination and palace intrigues, the revolts of factions may have changed dynasties, the wave of conquest may have ebbed and flowed; but the principle of the unlimited power of one man, of the pure despot, whether

it be Xerxes or Genghis Khan, the Sultan of Sulu or an adventurer like Aguinaldo, has never failed, and has maintained an undisputed acceptance throughout all the vast regions of the East.

You cannot change race tendencies in a moment. Habits of thought slowly formed through long periods of time, and based on physical, climatic, and geographical peculiarities, are more indestructible than the pyramids themselves. Only by very slow processes can they be modified or changed. Buckle's theory, that you could make a Hottentot into a European if you only took possession of him in infancy and gave him a European education among suitable surroundings, has been abandoned alike by science and history as grotesquely false. It is perhaps possible for an extremely clever and superior people like the Japanese, with their unsurpassed capacity of imitation, to adopt western forms of government; but whether the underlying conceptions—which are the only solid foundation of free institutions—can exist under such circumstances is yet to be proved, and all human experience is against the theory. These political conceptions are of very slow growth even among the races whose natural tendencies and instincts lead toward them, but in the particular instance which we are called upon to consider we are not left in the dark. We know what sort of government the Malay makes when he is left to himself. Study the history of the Malay States, and you will find that before the advent of the British residents they were governed by despotic chiefs, and their condition was one of incessant private or public war, coupled with a condition of society little, if any, short of anarchy. But we have an even better example in the Philippine Islands themselves. In the Sulu group and in the Island of Mindanao, you find

perfect types of the government which the Malay, when left to himself, naturally produces. These islands are ruled by sultans, who are supposed to have a general authority ; and more directly by *datos*, or local chiefs. Every one of these governments is a personal despotism of a more or less murderous character. The people of the islands which fell under the control of Spain have changed their religion, but they have not changed their habits of mind or their natural instincts. Give them unhampered liberty to do what they like, and you would have the governments of Sulu or Mindanao repeated. There would be modifications unquestionably, because Christianity has modified the character of the people ; but their political instincts are unchanged, and the only model of civilized government which they have had opportunity to know is the corrupt and broken rule of the Spaniard, who has himself emerged from despotism less than a hundred years ago. I am far from criticising or finding fault with the people about whom I make this statement. Aguinaldo's government was a pure military dictatorship. He took possession of the governmental machinery of Spain, such as it was ; but the military power, as you may see by referring to the account of the two naval officers who traveled throughout the island, was everywhere dominant. In Negros, which was friendly to us from the beginning, we gave the people the utmost latitude to do as they liked. They set up a government of their own, and chose their best men for office. It broke down, and they came of their own accord to our general and asked him again to assume control. They were not fit to carry on a government for themselves, and they themselves recognized it. Free government, as we know it, is no child's play to be learned in a moment. A republic like our own we know to be the freest and the

most representative government on earth, but we are apt to forget that it is also the most complicated and the most difficult. We are so accustomed to it that we do not remember that it is the result not merely of centuries of struggle, but, what is far more important, of a training and a mental habit which stretch back to the twilight of history.

Is it to be supposed that a people whose every instinct, every mode of thought, and every prejudice is hostile to what we consider the commonplaces of political existence, are going to take up in the twinkling of an eye and work successfully the most intricate forms of self-government ever devised by man? To make such an assumption is not only to betray an utter ignorance of history, but is to give the lie to all human experience. We must not confuse names with things. It does not follow because a government is called a republic that it is therefore a free government, as we understand it; or because it is called a monarchy that it is therefore a tyranny or a despotism. To the south of us lie many governments called republics. Are they free governments, as we understand the term? He would be a bold man who would undertake to answer that question in the affirmative. Haiti and Santo Domingo are called republics, and yet they are bloody tyrannies. The condition they create is anarchy. Neither life, liberty, nor property is safe; and as the islands slide downward in the scale of civilization the controlling power shifts from the hands of one military adventurer to those of another. Because they are called republics, will any one say that they are freer, more representative, better fitted for individual liberty and for civilization than the Government of Holland, which is called a monarchy? Again I say, let us not confuse names with things. The problem

we have before us is to give to people who have no conception of free government, as we understand it and carry it on, the opportunity to learn that lesson. What better proof could there be of their present unfitness for self-government than their senseless attacks upon us before anything had been done? Could anything demonstrate more fully the need of time and opportunity to learn the principles of self-government than this assault upon liberators and friends at the bidding of a self-seeking, self-appointed, unscrupulous autocrat and dictator? Some of the inhabitants of the Philippines, who have had the benefit of Christianity and of a measure of education, will, I have no doubt, under our fostering care and with peace and order, assume at once a degree of self-government and advance constantly, with our aid, toward a still larger exercise of that inestimable privilege; but to abandon those islands is to leave them to anarchy, to short-lived military dictatorships, to the struggle of factions, and, in a very brief time, to their seizure by some great Western power, who will not be at all desirous to train them in the principles of freedom, as we are, but who will take them because the world is no longer large enough to permit some of its most valuable portions to lie barren and ruined, the miserable results of foolish political experiments.

Now, Mr. President, before discussing the advantages to the United States which will accrue from our possession of these islands, I desire to state briefly the course of our action there since the outbreak of the insurrection.¹

We see that under Aguinaldo's government, which represented only the leaders who set it up, and never had

¹ I omit here a detailed review of events in the islands after our landing and of the suppression of the insurrection.

the support of anything but a very small proportion of the Filipino population, warfare of the most barbarous sort was carried on, and every kind of crime was committed, not only against every open enemy, but against helpless prisoners, and against the inhabitants of the islands, of whose freedom they were loudly proclaiming themselves the champions for the benefit of their sympathizers in the United States. We have no need to say that if we had left the Filipinos alone anarchy would have come. Anarchy came, and existed in full force wherever Aguinaldo held sway, coupled with bloodshed, pillage, and corruption.

Such are the men to whom it is seriously proposed that we should intrust the control of all the other millions of human beings, some half civilized, some wholly wild, who live in these other islands. Such is the government, stained with assassination, with the burning and pillage of the villages of their own people, with plans for the massacre of all foreigners, and for murder and looting in Manila, cruel, arbitrary, despotic, treacherous; such, I say, is the government which we are gravely asked to assist in forcing upon the innocent population of those islands, and we are denounced because we have not done it. To have recognized Aguinaldo's government and helped him to thrust it upon the other natives, or to have drawn aside and allowed him to try to wade "through slaughter to a throne," would have been a crime against humanity. Those who have urged, or who now urge, such a policy should study with care and with thoroughness the government of Aguinaldo. They never do so. They never take the trouble to learn the facts about the despotism which Aguinaldo and his friends tried to set up. They laugh at facts, deride all who are in a position to bear wit-

ness, sneer at history and experience, and declaim against the government for not giving recognition and support to something which never existed, which is the mere creature of their fancy.

How different their attitude when they come to considering the actions of their own countrymen. Men who will take the lightest word of a half-bred adventurer, of whose existence they had never heard two years ago, impugn the actions and doubt the statements of the highest officers of our government, of the commanders of our fleets and armies, of men who have gone in and out before the American people for years, and whose courage, patriotism, and honor have never been questioned or assailed. It must be a weak and bad cause, indeed, which rests its support upon accusations of falsehood and prevarication directed against the President and his advisers, and against the gallant and honorable men who wear our uniform and lead our army and our navy in the day of battle. The opponents of our policy have searched the record for every careless word ; they have thrown themselves eagerly on every idle rumor ; they have twisted facts ; they have imputed the worst motives to men who have proved their devotion to their country on the field of battle and in every department of civil life. Let us be just, at least, to our own. I ask no more. Take the evidence of all the men who have been in those islands and whose knowledge and experience entitle them to speak ; take the official record from day to day since the Spanish war began ; examine the report of your commissioners, your men of science, your army and navy officers ; read the utterances and the proclamations of the insurgent leader,—weigh, sift, discuss. Then face the facts, all the facts, and set down naught in malice. If this is done, there can be but one result. The

government of Aguinaldo will stand out as I have described it, for there is no escape from the evidence. Turn to the other side, and you will find, not that in a situation of great difficulty and delicacy there were no mistakes, but great cause for wonder that so few were made. You will find that our Admiral and our generals never swerved from the line laid down; that they made no false promises; that they carried patience and forbearance to such a point that it encouraged men of Asiatic mind to think us weak and timid, fit subjects for attack. You will find that they saved the great city from fire and sword; that they curbed the insurgents; that they dealt with them justly; that they grasped at every chance for peace, only to find that each proposition was a sham, with neither substance nor honesty in any negotiation offered. You will also find that when war was forced upon them, so soon as they had troops and opportunity they pushed it rapidly, effectively, and with the skill and gallantry characteristic of American soldiers to a successful conclusion.

Behind all this lies the policy of the President, which our officers followed by sea and land. History will say that it has been firm, consistent, and humane from the beginning. No false hopes were held out. From the dispatch of May 26 onward, the attitude of our government was clear and unmistakable. But every real hope, every proper promise, was freely offered and never violated. There are many duties imposed upon a President in which it is easy to imagine a personal or selfish motive, in which such motives might exist even if they do not. But here even the most malignant must be at loss to find the existence of a bad motive possible. Suddenly, at the end of the Spanish war we were confronted with the question of what should be done with the Philippines.

Their fate was in our hands. We were all able to discuss them, and to speculate as to what that fate should be. No responsibility rested upon us. But one man had to act. While the rest of the world was talking he had to be doing. The iron hand of necessity was upon his shoulder, and upon his alone. Act he must. No man in that high office seeks new burdens and fresh responsibilities, or longs to enter on new policies, with the unforeseen dangers which lie thick along untried paths. Every selfish motive, every personal interest, cried out against it. Every selfish motive, every personal interest, urged the President to let the Philippines go, and, like Gallio, to care for none of these things. It was so easy to pass by on the other side. But he faced the new conditions which surged up around him. When others then knew little, he knew much. Thus he came to see what duty demanded, duty to ourselves and to others. Thus he came to see what the interests of the American people required. Guided by this sense of duty, by the spirit of the American people in the past, by a wise statesmanship, which looked deeply into the future, he boldly took the islands. Since this great decision his policy has been firm and consistent. He has sought only what was best for the people of those islands and for his own people. It is all there in the record. Yet although he fought in his youth for liberty and union, he is now coarsely accused of infatuation for a vulgar Cæsarism. He who is known to everybody as one of the kindest of men, eager to do kindly acts to every one, is denounced as brutal and inhuman to a distant race whom he has sought in every way to benefit. When every selfish interest drew him in the other direction, he has been charged with self-seeking for following the hard and thorny path of duty.

I hesitate, Mr. President, in saying even as much as I have said. The President of the United States needs no defense at my hands. His own policy and his own acts in the East are his all-sufficient defense, both now and in history. But I have read and heard with amazement and regret the attacks which have been made upon the President in connection with the Philippines. I am well aware that malignity cannot raise imbecility above contempt. I know that only weak minds and bad tempers mistake abuse for argument. I am sure that it is needless to repel attacks from such sources. But, none the less, as one who has followed and studied all the details of his Eastern policy, I wish to make public record of my admiration for that policy and of my belief in it. As an American I believe it to be at once courageous, wise, and patriotic. The words of criticism or of praise which we utter here will pass with the hour of speech, but the great facts of the last two years will stand. In the long process of the patient years, those who now assail the President with epithet and imputation will shrink down beyond the ken of even the antiquarian's microscope; but the name of the President who took the Philippines and planted our flag at the portals of the East will stand out bright and clear upon the pages of history, where all men may read it, and he will have a monument better than any reared by human hands in fair and fertile islands blooming after long neglect, and in a race redeemed from tyranny and lifted up to broadening freedom and to larger hopes.

I come now to a consideration of the advantages to the United States involved in our acquisition and retention of the Philippine Islands, although I cannot hope in this respect to add to the eloquent statement

made from personal knowledge by the Senator from Indiana. When these arguments are offered in behalf of our Philippine policy, the opponents of that policy stigmatize them as sordid. I have never been able to see why they were any more sordid than arguments of exactly the same character urged against the retention of the islands, but we may let that inconsistency pass as one of the familiar incidents of political discussion. I do not myself consider them sordid, for anything which involves the material interests and the general welfare of the people of the United States seems to me of the highest merit and the greatest importance. Whatever duty to others might seem to demand, I should pause long before supporting any policy if there were the slightest suspicion that it was not for the benefit of the people of the United States. I conceive my first duty to be always to the American people, and I have ever considered it the cardinal principle of American statesmanship to advocate policies which would operate for the benefit of the people of the United States, and most particularly for the advantage of our farmers and our workingmen, upon whose well-being, and upon whose full employment at the highest wages, our entire fabric of society and government rests. In a policy which gives us a foothold in the East, which will open a new market in the Philippines, and enable us to increase our commerce with China, I see great advantages to all our people, and more especially to our farmers and our workingmen.

The disadvantages which are put forward seem to me unreal or at best trivial. Dark pictures are drawn of the enormously increased expense of the navy and of the army which will be necessitated by these new possessions. So far as the navy goes, our present fleet is now

entirely inadequate for our own needs. We require many more ships and many more men for the sure defense of the United States against foreign aggression, and our guarantee of peace rests primarily upon our navy. Neither the possession nor the abandonment of the Philippines would have the slightest effect upon the size of the Navy of the United States. If, as I hope, we shall build up a navy adequate to our needs, we shall have an abundant force to take care of the Philippines and find employment there in times of peace, without the addition of a man or a gun on account of our ownership of those islands.

The Philippines will entail upon us no naval expenses that we should not have in any event with a proper naval establishment. But the great bugbear is the army. Enormous sums have been stated here, all of them mere guesswork, to represent the increased expense to which we have been put by the call for troops for the Philippines. Although these statements are exaggerated, there can be no question that our military expenditure during the past year has been increased by the Philippines, because there has been a war going on in those islands which demanded a large body of troops. But that war is practically over. There is no reason to doubt that in a comparatively short time peace and order will be restored, and when we are considering what burden the possession of the islands will impose upon us we must proceed upon the normal conditions of peace. If we should employ in the Philippines as many American troops, proportionately, as England employs in British India, we should keep there an army of two thousand five hundred to three thousand men; but the fact that the Philippines are composed of scattered islands would undoubtedly necessitate the em-

ployment of a larger body than this. Spain found less than fifteen thousand men sufficient, and I think it is safe to say that if Spain was able to manage with fifteen thousand men, the same number of American soldiers would be enough to do very well what Spain did very badly. As to the expense involved, it seems to be entirely forgotten that the islands themselves are abundantly able to pay for the establishment there, both civil and military. Under Spanish rule, with all its bad administration and profound corruption the islands not only paid all their expenses, but made at times at least a return to the Spanish treasury. With revenues well and honestly administered, and with wise and honest expenditure, the islands in our hands would not only easily pay all the expenses of the military establishment, but of the civil government as well, and we could at the same time, by our superior honesty and efficiency, greatly lighten the burden of taxation. In a word, the Philippine Islands, as we should govern and administer them, would be entirely self-supporting, and would throw no burden of expense at all on the people of the United States after peace and order were once restored and business was again flowing in its normal channels.

We are also told that the possession of these islands brings a great responsibility upon us. This, Mr. President, I freely admit. A great nation must have great responsibilities. It is one of the penalties of greatness. But the benefit of responsibilities goes hand in hand with the burdens they bring. The nation which seeks to escape from the burden also loses the benefit, and if it cowers in the presence of a new task and shirks a new responsibility the period of its decline is approaching. That fatal hour may draw near on leaden feet, but weakness and timidity

are sure signs that it is coming, be its progress swift or slow. These islands, I well know, impose upon us new and great responsibilities, and I do not doubt that we shall make mistakes in dealing with them before we reach complete success, but I firmly believe that they will endure to our lasting benefit. The athlete does not win his race by sitting habitually in an armchair. The pioneer does not open up new regions to his fellow men by staying in warm shelter behind the city walls. A cloistered virtue is but a poor virtue, after all. Men who have done great things are those who have never shrunk from trial or adventure. If a man has the right qualities in him, responsibility sobers, strengthens, and develops him. The same is true of nations. The nation which fearlessly meets its responsibilities rises to the task when the pressure is upon it. I believe that these new possessions and these new questions, this necessity for watching over the welfare of another people, will improve our civil service, raise the tone of public life, and make broader and better all our politics and the subjects of political discussion. My faith in the American people is such that I have no misgiving as to their power to meet these responsibilities and to come out stronger and better for the test, doing full justice to others as well as to themselves.

So much for the objections commonly made to our Philippine policy, which have as little foundation, in my opinion, as those which proceed on the theory that we are engaged in the perpetration of a great wrong. Let us now look at the other side, and there, I believe, we shall find arguments in favor of the retention of the Philippines as possessions of great value and a source of profit to the people of the United States which cannot be overthrown. First, as to the islands themselves. They are over

a hundred thousand square miles in extent, and are of the greatest richness and fertility. From these islands comes now the best hemp in the world, and there is no tropical product which cannot be raised there in abundance. Their forests are untouched, of great extent, and with a variety of hard woods of almost unexampled value. Gold is found throughout all the islands, but not in large quantities, and there is no indication that the production of gold could ever reach a very great amount. There appears to be little or no silver. There are regions in Luzon containing great and valuable deposits of copper which have never been developed. But the chief mineral value of the islands is in their undeveloped coal beds, which are known to exist in certain parts and are believed to exist everywhere, and which are certainly very extensive and rich. The coal is said to be lignite, and, although 20 to 30 per cent inferior to our coals or to those of Cardiff, is practically as good as the Australian coal and better than that of Japan, both of which are largely used in the East to-day. To a naval and commercial power the coal measures of the Philippines will be a source of great strength and of equally great value. It is sufficient for me to indicate these few elements of natural wealth in the islands which only await development.

A much more important point is to be found in the markets which they furnish. The total value of exports and imports for 1896 amounted in round numbers to \$29,000,000, and this was below the average. The exports were nearly \$20,000,000, the imports a little over \$9,000,000. We took from the Philippines exports to the value of \$4,308,000, next in amount to the exports to Great Britain; but the Philippine Islands took from us imports to the value of only \$94,000. There can be no doubt that

the islands in our peaceful possession would take from us a very large proportion of their imports. Even as the islands are to-day there is opportunity for a large absorption of products of the United States, but it must not be forgotten that the islands are entirely undeveloped. The people consume foreign imports at the rate of only a trifle more than \$1 per capita. With the development of the islands and the increase of commerce and of business activity the consumption of foreign imports would rapidly advance, and of this increase we should reap the chief benefit. We shall also find great profit in the work of developing the islands. They require railroads everywhere. Those railroads would be planned by American engineers, the rails and the bridges would come from American mills, the locomotives and cars from American workshops. The same would hold true in regard to electric railways, electric lighting, telegraphs, telephones, and steamships for the local business. Some indication of what we may fairly expect may be found in the following tables of our exports to, and our imports from, our new possessions and Cuba in 1899 as compared with 1897.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS.

To —	1897.	1899.
Puerto Rico	\$2,023,751	\$3,677,564
Cuba	9,308,515	24,861,261
Philippines	69,459	1,663,213
Hawaii	5,478,224	11,305,581
Total	16,869,949	41,507,619

UNITED STATES IMPORTS.

From —	1897.	1899.
Puerto Rico	\$1,943,251	\$3,416,681
Cuba	16,233,456	29,619,759
Philippines	4,352,181	4,903,467
Hawaii	15,311,685	22,188,206
Total	37,840,573	60,228,113

By these figures it will be seen that our imports from the islands have increased \$23,000,000 and our exports to them \$25,000,000. The increase in exports is almost wholly to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, amounting to \$24,000,000 as against \$1,000,000 increase to the Philippines. Yet the opportunity for export to the Philippines is larger than to all the rest put together. The fact of the insurrection in the former accounts of course for the difference, but the great increase of exports to the islands where peace reigns shows what may be expected of the Philippines when like conditions prevail there. An increase of \$25,000,000 in our exports to the islands may strike some lofty minds as "sordid." To me that increase means wages and employment to a large number of American farmers and workingmen, and I therefore regard it as of the highest beneficence and importance, and as a striking justification of the policy which finds in our possession of these islands not only advantages to their inhabitants, but an expansion of trade which will be of profit and value to American labor and American industry. Thus it is demonstrated that we should gain in the Philippines themselves, under normal and peaceful conditions and with the growing prosperity which our control would bring, a

market of very great value to the workingmen, the operatives, and the farmers of the United States.

But the value of the Philippine Islands, both natural and acquired, and as a market for our products, great as it undoubtedly is, and greater as it unquestionably will be, is trifling compared to the indirect results which will flow from our possession of them. From the time of the war between China and Japan it became apparent that great changes were impending in the East, changes which many economists and publicists believed would play the master part in the history of the next century. The struggle for the world's trade, which has for many years been shaping ever more strongly the politics and the history of mankind, has its richest prize set before it in the vast markets of China. Every great nation has recognized the importance of this prize, either by the acquisition of Chinese territory or by obtaining certain rights and privileges through treaty. But after the war between China and Japan this movement rapidly assumed an acute form. It grew daily more apparent that Russia was closing in upon the Chinese Empire, and that her policy, at once slow and persistent, aimed at nothing less than the exclusion of other nations from the greatest market of the world. To us, with our increasing population, and an agricultural and industrial production which was advancing by leaps and bounds, the need of new markets in the very near future, if we hoped to maintain full employment and ample returns to our farmers and our workingmen, was very clear. More than ready to take our chance in a fair field against all rivals, and with full faith in the indomitable ingenuity and enterprise of our people, it was more than ever important that we should not be shut out from any market by unjust or peculiar discriminations if by any methods

such a misfortune could be avoided. The great danger to our interests in China became clearer and clearer, as the months went by, to those who watched the progress of great economic and political forces outside our own boundaries. I do not think that there were many who did so, but I remember very well that some time before the Spanish War the senior Senator from Colorado pointed out in a public interview the importance of the Chinese question and the necessity that would soon be upon us of taking some steps in conjunction with England and Japan, and very probably with Germany and with France, in order to prevent our exclusion from that empire by the great power of the north which was closing down upon it. There were others who felt in the same way, although I do not think they were very numerous; but I am quite sure that nobody saw very clearly how we were to assert in the East our rights and interests, which were so important to the welfare of our agriculture and our industry. That Hawaii was necessary as the first and essential step toward our obtaining that share to which we were entitled in the trade of the Pacific, the ocean of the future, was obvious enough, but beyond that all was doubt and darkness. Then came the Spanish War, and the smoke of Dewey's guns had hardly cleared away when it was seen by those who were watching that he had not only destroyed the Spanish fleet, but had given to his countrymen the means of solving their problem in the far East. He had made us an Eastern power. He had given us not only the right to speak, but the place to speak from.

Let me now try to show the importance and meaning of the Eastern question, with regard to which Dewey's victory has given us such a commanding position. The Empire of China has a population of which we have no

accurate statistics, but which is certainly over four hundred millions. The rate of consumption among the Chinese per capita is at present low, but even as it stands it affords a great market for foreign imports. The work of opening up the country by railroads and of developing its still untouched natural resources has begun, and is advancing with giant strides. There is the greatest opportunity in China for trade expansion which exists anywhere in the world. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the value of the Chinese trade to us now despite our neglect of it, and to the enormous advance which that trade has made in the last four years, and more especially since the Spanish War carried our flag into the East and turned the attention of our people more sharply to the unlimited opportunities for commerce which there exist.

In our commerce with China during 1889-99 there was a gain of \$13,293,168. The increase occurred almost entirely in the export trade, which advanced from \$2,791,128 in 1889 to \$14,493,440 in 1899. Our imports for 1899, amounting to \$18,619,268, were only slightly larger than in 1889, when a value of \$17,028,412 was reported. The exports to China, like those to Japan, showed an exceptional growth in 1897, 1898, and 1899, the records for these years being \$11,924,433, \$9,992,894, and \$14,493,440, respectively. Our trade with the port of Hongkong, although less important than that credited directly with China, was nearly doubled during 1898-99, making a gain of \$5,045,149. The exports for 1899 had a value of \$7,732,525 as compared with only \$3,686,384 for 1889. The imports were considerably smaller and showed marked fluctuations. In 1889 they were valued at \$1,480,266, but these figures were not equaled again until 1899, when a value of \$2,479,274 was recorded. From these figures

it will be seen that our exports to China and Hongkong in 1899 were over \$22,000,000, and that the growth in the last three years had been phenomenal. The gain in exports to China, Hongkong, and Japan in 1899 over 1889 was 256 per cent, and it almost all came in the last years of the decade.

I will not take the time of the Senate in analyzing these figures and showing the different articles of export which make up these totals. That has all been most admirably done in the bulletin of the Department of Agriculture prepared by Mr. Hitchcock upon our trade with China, Japan, and Hongkong. I have not touched upon our trade with Japan at all, but I would strongly recommend a study of this bulletin, which shows how much our possession of the Philippines and our increased interests in the East have stimulated our trade with that country. There are two points, however, to which I wish to call especial attention, because they emphasize and demonstrate the great value to our farming and manufacturing interests of this vast Chinese market into which we are just entering. In 1898 we sent nearly four million dollars' worth of wheat flour to Hongkong alone, while to China we sent \$5,203,427 worth of cotton manufactures in the same year and over \$9,000,000 worth, as compared with only \$2,854,221 worth for 1894. These are illustrations in two leading articles of what the Chinese market means to the Western growers of wheat and to the manufacturers of cotton. Nearly all these cotton manufactures came from the South, and have been to our Southern mills a source of great profit, while at the same time they have relieved the pressure upon the domestic market, and are thus a direct benefit to every cotton factory in New England or in any other part of the country. *Ex pede Herculem!* From these two items as

well as from the long lists of Mr. Hitchcock, we can judge what the trade of China is to us to-day and what it is destined to be. The loss of that market and of its prospects and possibilities I should regard as one of the greatest calamities which could befall the farmers and the workmen of the United States. How, then, are we to hold and develop it? Look at your tables of statistics and note the increases which have occurred since the capture of Manila. The mere fact that we hold the Philippine Islands increases our trade with all the East—with China and Japan alike. Trade certainly has followed the flag, and its appearance at Manila has been the signal for this marked growth in our commerce with the neighboring states and empires.

But we must go a step further. Having this opportunity to obtain a large and increasing share in the trade of China, how shall we make sure that it is not taken from us? We know well that China is threatened by Russia, and that Russian dominion, if unrestrained, would mean discrimination and exclusion in the Chinese markets. Sooner than any one dreamed it has been shown how far the Philippines have solved this pressing problem for us. The possession of the Philippines made us an Eastern power, with the right and, what was equally important, the force behind the right to speak. Mr. Hay, as Secretary of State, has obtained from all the great powers of Europe their assent to our demand for the guaranty of all our treaty rights in China and for the maintenance of the policy of the open door. I do not belittle one of the most important and most brilliant diplomatic achievements in our hundred years of national existence when I say that the assent of these other powers to the propositions of the United States was given to the master of Manila. They

might have turned us aside three years ago with a shrug and a smile, but to the power which held Manila Bay, and whose fleet floated upon its waters, they were obliged to give a gracious answer. Manila, with its magnificent bay, is the prize and the pearl of the East. In our hands it will become one of the greatest distributing points, one of the richest emporiums of the world's commerce. Rich in itself, with all its fertile islands behind it, it will keep open to us the markets of China, and enable American enterprise and intelligence to take a master share in all the trade of the Orient. We have been told that arguments like these are sordid. Sordid, indeed! Then what arguments are worthy of consideration? A policy which proposes to open wider markets to the people of the United States, to add to their employment, and to increase their wages, and which in its pursuit requires that we should save the teeming millions of China from the darkness of the Russian winter, and keep them free, not merely for the incoming of commerce, but for the entrance of the light of Western civilization, seems to me a great and noble policy, if there ever was such, and one which may well engage the best aspirations and the highest abilities of American statesmanship.

Thus, Mr. President, I have shown that duty and interest alike, duty of the highest kind and interest of the highest and best kind, impose upon us the retention of the Philippines, the development of the islands, and the expansion of our Eastern commerce. All these things, in my belief, will come to pass, whatever the divisions of the present moment; for no people who have come under our flag have ever sought to leave it, and there is no territory which we have acquired that any one would dream of giving up. All our vast growth and expansion have been due to the

spirit of our race, and have been guided by the instinct of the American people, which in all great crises has proved wiser than any reasoning. This mighty movement westward, building up a nation and conquering a continent as it swept along, has not been the work of chance or accident. It was neither chance nor accident which brought us to the Pacific and which has now carried us across the great ocean even to the shores of Asia, to the very edge of the cradle of the Aryans, whence our far distant ancestors started on the march which has since girdled the world.

Call up your own history as witness. It was not inevitable that we should take Louisiana. We could have remained shut up between the Mississippi and the Atlantic and allowed another people to build the great city where New Orleans stands. But it was inevitable, if we followed the true laws of our being, that we should be masters of the Mississippi and spread from its mouth to its source. It was not inevitable that the union of States should endure. Had we so chosen we could have abandoned it, but if we had abandoned it we should have gone down to nothingness, a disintegrated chaos of petty republics. We determined that the Union should live, and then it was inevitable that it should come to what it is to-day. There was nothing inevitable about the Monroe Doctrine. We need never have asserted it, need never have maintained it. Had we failed to do both we should have had Europe established all about us; we should have been forced to become a nation of great standing armies; our growth and power would have been choked and stifled. But we have declared and upheld it. We have insisted that all the world should heed it, and it is one of the signs of the times that in The Hague Convention we have ob-

tained at last a formal recognition of it from all the nations of Europe. Yet the Monroe Doctrine is far more than a proposition of international law which we have laid down. Millions of men are ready to fight for that doctrine who could not define its terms, and who have never read, perhaps, the famous message which announced it. That is because the instinct of the people recognizes in that doctrine a great principle of national life. Without clinging to it we should be in constant peril, our evolution would be retarded, our existence menaced. The European power which attempts to establish itself in new possessions in the Americas, whether on a little island or in a continental state, from Patagonia to the Rio Grande, is our enemy. We are ready to fight upon that "theme until our eyelids do no longer wag." Is it because we want territory to the south of us? Far from it. It is because we know by instinct that it is a law of our being, a principle of our national life, that no power from over seas shall come into this hemisphere to thwart our policy or to cross our path. The Monroe Doctrine, with all it implies, is inevitable if we are to be true to the laws of our being.

Like every great nation, we have come more than once in our history to where the road of fate divided. Thus far we have never failed to take the right path. Again are we come to the parting of the ways. Again a momentous choice is offered to us. Shall we hesitate and make, in coward fashion, what Dante calls "the great refusal"? Even now we can abandon the Monroe Doctrine, we can reject the Pacific, we can shut ourselves up between our oceans, as Switzerland is inclosed among her hills, and then it would be inevitable that we should sink out from among the great powers of the world and heap

up riches that some stronger and bolder people, who do not fear their fate, might gather them. Or we may follow the true laws of our being, the laws in obedience to which we have come to be what we are, and then we shall stretch out into the Pacific; we shall stand in the front rank of the world powers; we shall give to our labor and our industry new and larger and better opportunities; we shall prosper ourselves; we shall benefit mankind. What we have done was inevitable because it was in accordance with the laws of our being as a nation, in the defiance and disregard of which lie ruin and retreat.

I know well the objections which are made to this theory of national life. I have heard much criticism upon the word "inevitable" as applied to our movement into the far East. Still more censure has been directed against our familiar phrase of "manifest destiny." It has been intimated that it is the tyrant's and the robber's plea, the coward's excuse, and the hypocrite's pretense to say that these events which have taken place since 1898 were inevitable. Such criticism proceeds on what seems to me a total misconception. I should be the last to deny the doctrine of free will, but I believe most profoundly that when certain conditions are given, certain results are sure to come. I believe this because I believe in the reign of law. We stand like children on the seashore, knowing only the shells and the pebbles where we tread, understanding only the ripple of the waves breaking at our feet, while far away before us stretches the great ocean of knowledge, whose confines we cannot see, and whose possessions we can only dimly guess. We catalogued the visible stars and then photographed the heavens, only to find far beyond the bodies which the most powerful telescopes can disclose myriads of stars and systems glimmer-

ing away into infinite space. What they are, what other worlds than ours there may be, we do not know, but we have learned that they move in obedience to law. When science demonstrates its theories, it tells us little more than that —

The spangled heavens a shining frame,
Their great original proclaim.

The doctrine of the old theologians and schoolmen that the universe was all made for man, is no more vain and arrogant than the assertion that man is too insignificant to find place in the great system of universal law. The same laws which govern the movements of the uncounted stars in space, tint the wings of the moth so that his keen-eyed enemy cannot distinguish him from the dead leaf or the roughened bark, and paint the little sand spider so cunningly that unless he move his most virulent pursuer would not know that he was not part of the glittering grains among which he hides. If we assume a system capable of regulating the stars in their courses, it must be one equally able to color the moth or hide the spider. If there is a controlling law, it must be one which grasps the infinitely little as well as the infinitely great, for any other would be limited and finite. If we say with reverence, as the greatest of poets said, that we are in the care of Him "who doth the ravens feed; yea, providently caters for the sparrow," are we to suppose that nations alone are not subject to law? Are we to believe it possible that the races of men go stumbling blindly through the centuries, the playthings of chance, the helpless victims of their own passions?

Science has revealed the immense antiquity of man, and has demonstrated that through æons of time the race has been migrating hither and thither, shifting and chang-

ing, developing civilizations which have perished off the face of the earth, leaving only dumb symbols carved on stone, or hardened bones which the rock alone preserves. Yet were they always moving, these long-vanished people, always striving, always rising up or sinking down in obedience to unknown, inexorable laws which governed alike their growth and their decay. There seems to have been a process of evolution governed by law, which ruled them and their fate; that at least we have reason to believe, even if we are still too ignorant to understand and state the laws which govern us.

Then history takes up the wondrous tale, and the whole effort of modern research is in the passionate demand that she reveal to us the laws which have ruled in the short period over which she holds sway. That there were laws we feel sure, and very slowly, very dimly, we are beginning, as we believe, to discern what they were. We detect them in the migrations of tribes and races; we can see their operations in the rise and fall of nations and empires. One people fades out of existence; another grows, and climbs, and inherits the earth. Very far removed as it is from an exact science, history still teaches clearly enough that the evolution of nations depends upon laws of their being, which, if obeyed, lead in one direction, if disobeyed are replaced by others which will carry the disobedient to a widely different fate. I believe, therefore, that men and nations are, like all else in the universe, the subjects of laws; that if they obey the laws of their being and follow them rightly they will succeed; that if they violate these laws they fall the victims of others equally powerful, and go down to failure and dishonor.

I do not believe that this nation was an accident. I do not believe that it is the creation of blind chance. I have

faith that it has a great mission in the world — a mission of good, a mission of freedom. I believe that it can live up to that mission; therefore I want to see it step forward boldly and take its place at the head of the nations. I wish to see it master of the Pacific. I would have it fulfill what I think is its manifest destiny, if it is not false to the laws which govern it. I am not dreaming of a primrose path. I know well that in the past we have committed grievous mistakes and paid for them, done wrong and made heavy compensation for it, stumbled and fallen and suffered. But we have always risen, bruised and grimed sometimes, yet still we have risen stronger and more erect than ever, and the march has always been forward and onward. Onward and forward it will still be, despite stumblings and mistakes as before, while we are true to ourselves and obedient to the laws which have ruled our past and will still govern our future. But when we begin to distrust ourselves, to shrink from our own greatness, to shiver before the responsibilities which come to us, to retreat in the face of doubts and difficulties, then indeed peril will be near at hand. I would have our great nation always able to say : —

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul.

I have unbounded faith and pride in my country. I am proud of her past, and in that past I read her future. I do not read it in any vain or boastful temper, but with a spirit of reverence and gratitude for all that has gone, and with a very humble prayer that we may make the present and future worthy of the past.

SPEECH AT CANTON, OHIO, NOTIFYING
PRESIDENT McKINLEY OF HIS SECOND
NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY BY
THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVEN-
TION AT PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 19, 1900.

JULY 12, 1900.

SPEECH AT CANTON, OHIO, NOTIFYING
PRESIDENT McKINLEY OF HIS SECOND
NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

MR. PRESIDENT: This Committee, representing every State in the Union and the organized Territories of the United States, was duly appointed to announce to you formally your nomination by the Republican National Convention, which met in Philadelphia June 19 last, as the candidate of the Republican party for President of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1901.

To be selected by the Republican party as their candidate for this great office is always one of the highest honors which can be given to any man. This nomination, however, comes to you, sir, under circumstances which give it a higher significance and make it an even deeper expression of honor and trust than usual. You were nominated unanimously at Philadelphia. You received the unforced vote of every delegate from every state and every territory. The harmony of sentiment which appears on the face of the record was but the reflection of the deeper harmony which existed in the hearts and minds of the delegates. Without faction, without dissent, with profound satisfaction and eager enthusiasm you were nominated for the presidency by the united voice of the representatives of our great party, in which there is neither sign of division nor shadow of turning. Such unanimity, always remarkable,

is here the more impressive because it accompanies a second nomination to the great office which you have held for four years. It is not the facile triumph of hope over experience, but the sober approval of conduct and character tested in many trials and tried by heavy and extraordinary responsibilities.

With the exception of the period in which Washington organized the nation and built the state, and of those other awful years when Lincoln led his people through the agony of civil war and saved from destruction the work of Washington, there has never been a presidential term in our history so crowded with great events, so filled with new and momentous questions, as that which is now drawing to its end. True to the declarations which were made at St. Louis in 1896, you, sir, united with the Republicans in Congress in the revision of the tariff and the reëstablishment of the protective policy. You maintained our credit and upheld the gold standard, leading the party by your advice to the passage of the great measure which is to-day the bulwark of both. You led again in the policy which has made Hawaii a possession of the United States. On all these questions you fulfilled the hopes and justified the confidence of the people, who four years ago put trust in our promises. But on all these questions you had as guides not only your own principles, the well-considered results of years of training and reflection, but also the plain declarations of the National Convention which nominated you in 1896. Far different was it when the Cuban question, which we had also promised to settle, brought first war, then peace, with Spain. Congress declared war, but you, as Commander-in-Chief, had to carry it on. You did so, and history records unbroken victory from the first shot of the Nashville to the day when the

protocol was signed. The peace you had to make alone. Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines; you had to assume alone the responsibility of taking them all from Spain. Alone and weighted with the terrible responsibility of the unchecked war powers of the Constitution, you were obliged to govern these islands, and to repress rebellion and disorder in the Philippines. No party creed defined the course you were to follow. Courage, foresight, comprehension of American interest, now and in the uncharted future, faith in the American people and in their fitness for great tasks, were your only guides and counselors. Thus you framed and put in operation this great new policy which has made us at once masters of the Antilles and a great Eastern power, holding firmly our possessions on both sides of the Pacific.

The new and strange ever excite fear, and the courage and prescience which accept them always arouse criticism and attack. Yet a great departure and a new policy were never more quickly justified than these undertaken by you. On the possession of the Philippines rests the admirable diplomacy which warned all nations that American trade was not to be shut out of China. It is to Manila that we owe the ability to send troops and ships to the defense of our ministers, our consuls, our missionaries, and our merchants in China, instead of being compelled to leave our citizens to the casual protection of other powers, as would have been unavoidable had we flung the Philippines away. Rest assured, sir, that the vigorous measures which you have thus been enabled to take, and all further measures in the same direction which you may take, for the protection of American lives and property, will receive the hearty support of the people of the United States, who are now, as always, determined that the American citizen shall be

protected at any cost in all his rights everywhere and at all times. It is to Manila again, to our fleet in the bay and our army on the land, that we shall owe the power, when these scenes of blood in China are closed, to exact reparation, to enforce stern justice, and to insist in the final settlement upon an open door to all that vast market for our fast growing commerce. Events moving with terrible rapidity have been swift witnesses to the wisdom of your action in the East. The Philadelphia Convention has adopted your policy both in the Antilles and in the Philippines, and has made it that of the Republican party.

Your election, sir, next November, assures to us the continuance of that policy abroad and in our new possessions. To intrust these difficult and vital questions to other hands, at once incompetent and hostile, would be a disaster to us and a still more unrelieved disaster to our posterity. Your election also means not only protection to our industries but the maintenance of a sound currency and of the gold standard, the very corner stones of our economic and financial welfare. Should they be shaken, as they would be by the success of our opponents, the whole fabric of our business confidence and prosperity would fall into ruin. Your defeat would be the signal for the advance of free trade, for the anarchy of a debased and unstable currency, for business panic, depression and hard times, and for the wreck of our foreign policy. Your election and the triumph of the Republican party—which we believe to be as sure as the coming of the day—will make certain the steady protection of our industries, sound money, and a vigorous and intelligent foreign policy. They will continue those conditions of good government and wise legislation so essential to the

prosperity and well-being which have blessed our country so abundantly during the past four years.

Thus announcing to you, sir, your nomination as the Republican candidate for the presidency, we have the honor also to submit to you the declaration of principles made by the National Convention, which we trust will receive your approval. We can assure you of the faithful and earnest support of the Republican party in every state, and we beg you to believe that it is with feelings of the deepest personal gratification that we discharge here to-day this honorable duty imposed upon us by the Convention.

SPEECH AT THE INAUGURATION OF
HENRY S. PRITCHETT AS PRESIDENT
OF THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY.

OCTOBER 24, 1900.

SPEECH AT THE INAUGURATION OF HENRY
S. PRITCHETT AS PRESIDENT OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECH-
NOLOGY.

I FEEL much honored in being permitted to take part in these inaugural ceremonies. It is a privilege which I highly appreciate, and which gratifies me both on public and private grounds. I am glad to share in this occasion, so important to the Institute of Technology, in which, in common with all citizens of Massachusetts, I feel so much pride. It is a personal gratification also to escape for a moment from the heat and turmoil of a political campaign, where there is much distortion of facts, into the cool, calm atmosphere of science and learning. Pleasant, too, is it for the much criticised to have the rare opportunity of speaking to some of his critics, for the often lectured to stand for a moment in the place of the lecturer.

The act which you perform to-day is one of grave importance, and it is the significance of that act which I would fain make the theme of the few words I shall say. You are about to inaugurate formally a new President of the Institute. Very fortunate is that man to whom it is thus given to stand at the head of a great institution of learning; for to him have come those things which are most to be desired by strong men,—work worth doing and a great opportunity. He is a builder; he is shaping the

unknown future. Nothing can be finer than this, for it is far better to create than to destroy. To him is confided in part the young life of the country. Presidents and professors grow old and pass away, the catalogue lengthens, and great names shine out upon it as the stars begin to burn in the heavens after the setting of the sun; history and traditions gather as the years flit past; the walls of the buildings grow gray and mellow beneath the touch of time; but the college itself is ever young. Eternal youth is always there, as the succeeding generations come and go. To the president of the college or the institute falls the task of moulding and leading all these young lives marching along in unending procession. He is their chief, their leader, their captain. It is a responsibility as noble as it is great. Napoleon said, "I have no bad regiments: I have some bad colonels"; and, as a bad colonel ruins a regiment, so a bad president can turn awry the whole life of a college, and thus affect for ill the future of his country.

In some respects the duties of the head of any great institution of learning have changed with the vast growth of our colleges and universities. He is no longer primarily a preacher or an instructor. He must be, first of all, a leader of men and an administrator. He no longer is himself a teacher; but he must, like Bacon, take all learning for his province, and provide that in every branch and in every department there shall be the best teaching and the most skilled masters. In another respect, and that the most important, the highest duty of the instructor of youth is the same now as it has always been, and falls alike upon all who teach, from the schoolmaster among his boys to the chief of the great university. This highest duty is not easy to define. No laws prescribe it,

no formulas explain it. It is the influence which the chief exerts, the tone he gives, the spirit he inspires, the impression he makes. Vague as it is, however, it carries with it in its fulfillment all the difference between success and failure. Impalpable and unseen, it is yet as necessary to the life of a college as the air of heaven is to our physical life. The powerful rhyme of the poet outlasts the gilded monument of princes, habits of thought endure through centuries which sweep away the mightiest buildings raised by men ; and so the personal influence of the leader is felt throughout the lives of those whom he has led in the first flush of their youth.

There were tones in the voice that whispered then
You may hear to-day in a hundred men.

That which is beyond the ken of book-lore or microscope lies in the personal influence of the commander. The soldiers may be all equally well drilled, they may be armed and uniformed alike, of the same quality of blood and race and courage ; and yet one regiment will cast itself into the imminent and deadly breach, carrying all before it in a victorious charge, while another loiters and hesitates. There are no bad regiments : there are some bad colonels. From a college or an institute students may go forth filled with the spirit of their time and country, ready and eager for battle, the light of hope and victory in their eyes, or they may come out into the world's strife doubters, critics, scoffers, fault-finders, fit only to linger in the plain while their comrades scale the heights. It is not the winning or the losing that is important, but fighting the good fight in the great world of action. The men who have caught the inspiration of the real leader may plant their flag upon the ramparts or they may let —

The victors when they come,
When the forts of folly fall,
Find their bodies at the wall.

In either event the world is better for their having lived in it; and as for the other sort, who never charge at all, but merely know how the charge ought to have been made, it matters little whether they have lived or not.

What, then, are the vital qualifications for the leaders of American youth? They are four, I think, — high character, ample learning, proved executive capacity, and the training and experience of a man of the world in the best and broadest sense. As to the first three requisites, all persons will, I think, agree. The need of the last qualification is not, perhaps, quite so obvious; yet it is absolutely essential if the head of the great institution of learning is to imbue his students with the right spirit, and send them out to play in the world a part worth playing. Every great position has its peculiar perils and temptations. To this rule, and I say this with the utmost deference to those I see about me, the presidents of colleges and institutes are no exception. The dangers to be shunned by men holding these great and responsible offices is the conviction, which easily arises, that the college world is the whole world, and that university and universe are interchangeable terms. It is a grave misfortune to the country as well as to the institution itself when the onlooker, turning to its chief for precept and example, is reminded of Pope's satire, and cannot refrain from murmuring to himself: —

Like Cato give his little Senate laws,
And sit attentive to his own applause.
Who would not laugh if such a man there be?
Who would not weep if Atticus were he?

When intolerance or narrow views possess the chief, it is certain that the spirit and the tone impressed upon the students under his care will not be the right ones. Their critical faculties may be sharpened, but their enthusiasm and hopes will be chilled. Their self-complacency will undoubtedly be enhanced, but their effectiveness will be sadly diminished.

An experience in the world of men and in large affairs is the surest armor against this dangerous and hurtful frame of mind. In the world-school any being not wholly dense learns that difference of opinion does not necessarily mean that he who differs from one is either knave or fool, or both. To any open-minded man experience in the great arena of action brings understanding, if he is of the right fibre, of the life of the time and of sympathy with it. He comes from that teaching to feel with Fra Lippo Lippi that this world is not a blot or blank, but means intensely, and means good.

Let me turn from general propositions to a concrete illustration of my meaning. In the gentleman whom you inaugurate to-day as President of your great Institution of Technology, the high qualifications which I have enumerated as necessary for such a place all meet in happy combination. He has high character, generous learning, an assured place in the domain of science. He has proved his executive capacity by his successful administration of a great government survey. He has lived in the world of men, labored with them, fought against them, learned that liberality and toleration are not incompatible with an unflinching opposition to wrong, learned also to do justice to opponents, become convinced that it is better to get the best possible than to prate idly about an impossible perfection, find fault perpetually and get nothing. The ig-

norance of the cloister can never dim the knowledge thus acquired, nor harsh and narrow prejudices warp a judgment which, while it is keen, is also just. He brings to your service and to the broader service of Massachusetts and of the country all these high qualities. He will send forth his students imbued with his own faith and hope, in harmony with the spirit of the time of America. No man, I am sure, will rival him in devotion to his charge or in his admiration for it. But he will not forget that the little world he guides and rules is part of the greater world of the United States, borne on the mighty current of the national life as the tides of the ocean bear the ship, and that he who serves the country best, in training her sons, best serves the noble institution committed to his care.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE
CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

APRIL 10, 1908.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF MASSACHUSETTS.

APRIL 10, 1908.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have ventured to ask the privilege of the floor, in order that I may say to the convention that it is my earnest hope that the platform which has been unanimously reported by your committee on resolutions may be adopted without amendment and without addition. I think it must be obvious to every one that the committee on resolutions has endeavored to settle the controversies which have arisen among us, by a statement which should recognize existing facts, which should involve no sacrifice of principle on either side, and which nevertheless will make for harmony and for the welfare of the party.

I reveal no secret when I say that we owe this settlement to the wisdom, the patience, the self-control, and the devotion to the interests of the Republican party, of the committee of the Taft League and of my distinguished colleague now on the platform [referring to Senator Crane]. As one Massachusetts Republican, I wish to express my obligations to them all.

If you will permit me,—and I think the importance of the occasion may, perhaps, justify it,—I am going to ask again for the indulgence, which the state conventions of

Massachusetts have so often accorded to me, to speak to you for a few moments upon the situation which has arisen. I should like you to know why it is that the acting governor of the Commonwealth, and myself and others who feel with us, have taken the position that we are well known to have held in the settlement of those controversies which had unfortunately arisen.

I think—if I may say one single word of myself—that the Republicans of Massachusetts know me well enough to be aware that I am not timid in political strife and that I do not shrink from the conflicts of politics. I have tried to do my share for many years in fighting the battles of the party in this State. I have not been accused of being too mild. There have even been those who thought I was, perhaps, too combative. But I will say this, at least,—that, if I have not given quarter in some of our political debates before the people, I never asked for any; and therefore I think I shall not be misunderstood in what I am about to say. I welcome the conflicts which we have with the opposition. I am always ready to do what I can to sustain the principles of the Republican party in every campaign. I have done this for many years. While health and strength are accorded to me—if you continue to me the confidence you have given me so long, I shall try always to do my share. But I never had much love for conflicts within the party, and as I have grown older I have lost all taste for them. I do not covet any victory over a fellow Republican, and therefore I welcome the settlement which has been made here to-day.

I know that our agreement will disappoint our common enemy—and I use the adjective in no offensive sense. They have been filling the air with predictions of the disruption of the Republican party. They have been win-

ning elections, as they usually do, in April. But they have overlooked the fact that we like liberty and law and order in our conventions; that the principles of Springfield—I do not refer to the city itself, but to the late convention there—that the principles of the late Springfield convention have never found a lodgment with us. And they have also overlooked the fact that the Republican party has a great deal of intelligence. Perhaps they are even less familiar with that quality than with the others. I am glad to disappoint them, but I think that the result here attained ought also to gratify every Republican who loves his party and who believes that its success is for the best interests of the great country to which our first love is given. I would never sacrifice principle to anything. But I cherish the union and harmony which have marked Massachusetts Republican politics for these many years, and I would make many sacrifices to maintain them.

We have had many contests among ourselves—wholesome, honest contests, necessary to the life of a vigorous party; but we have had no bitter factions such as tear a party asunder and lead it to defeat at the polls. In 1893 I took my seat in the Senate of the United States. There was a Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House. There was a Democratic governor in Massachusetts, and there were five Democratic congressmen in her body of representation. In that year we redeemed the State and elected a Republican governor, and at the next election only one Democratic congressman went from Massachusetts to Washington. In 1896 we swept the country and put a Republican President in the White House and a Republican Speaker in the chair of the House of Representatives. From the day of the election of McKinley

down to the present time the course of the national party has been one of uninterrupted success, until to-day the Senate of the United States, which is the sure index of party power, covering, as it does, with its long term of service a period of years, shows sixty-one Republican senators out of ninety-two.

We know what the record of Massachusetts has been in that time—unbroken victory, with one single exception, an exception which never comes to my mind without a feeling of bitter regret. One of the ablest, one of the best, one of the most courageous governors¹ that the State ever had was without reason, and wholly unjustifiably, as I believe, defeated. If we had respected him and honored him when he held his high office, the cheerful courage and manliness with which he accepted unmerited and undeserved defeat have made him stand higher in the opinion of every Massachusetts man. Within a week he has laid the Republicans of Massachusetts again under his debt by an act of complete unselfishness, by an act of devotion to the party in the interest of party success and party harmony which the Republicans of Massachusetts will not forget.

Now, Mr. President, during all that period we have had the power and the conditions I have described. There have been no conflicts in the delegation at Washington. There has been no strife between senators, there has been none between representatives, and there has been none between senators and representatives. We have always presented there in all these years the agreeable spectacle of a delegation from the State of Massachusetts absolutely united in the interests of the State. We have differed occasionally, as men must differ; but we have never had

¹ Governor John L. Bates.

a single quarrel, we have had no miserable squabbles over patronage. We have had no factional fights. I had at one time the misfortune to differ widely with my colleague [Mr. Hoar] on a great question of international policy. It never cast the slightest shade upon our friendship or upon our confidence in each other. One of the acts of my life to which I look back with the greatest pleasure — probably forgotten by almost everybody except myself — was that at that time when the party undoubtedly by a great majority stood with the administration and with the views which I advocated, I had the pleasure to stand upon this platform and say to the assembled Republicans of Massachusetts that they ought to return to the Senate without a dissenting voice their great Senator, George F. Hoar. It is that spirit which has been the spirit of Massachusetts. I think it is a spirit to which it is worth while to make some sacrifices. I like to have party harmony, as we are going to have it to-day, because I believe it is not a mere form of words, but a permanent advantage and a lasting principle.

Now, Mr. President, I have advocated the adoption of this platform on the ground of party harmony. But I will not disguise from you or from this convention that I have also been influenced in the attitude which I have taken by a motive which I think you will all appreciate and approve. I have been influenced by the motive of friendship. Mr. President, as we grow older and the shadows begin to lengthen and the leaves which seemed so thick in youth above our heads grow thin and let us see the sky beyond ; as those in the ranks in front drop away and we come in sight, as we all must, of the eternal rifle-pits, a man begins to feel that, among the really precious things of life, more lasting and more substantial

than many or all of the objects of ambition here, is the love of those whom he loves and the friendships of those whose friendship he prizes.

I have been long associated in politics and in all the ways of friendship with my colleague in the Senate. He has been a very good friend to me. He has been a wise, sagacious governor of this Commonwealth. He has been an upright, a loyal, a devoted Republican. I for one want to do everything I can to make his path smooth and to do what he desires. He would never ask any man to sacrifice a principle to him. But I think he has not only won the honors which he holds at your hands, but that he has also earned your confidence, your respect, and your consideration (turning to Senator Crane, who sat upon the platform). I wanted to say this much on this particular occasion, because the figure which Shakespeare introduces as a prologue to an act — “Rumor painted full of tongues” — has held the entire stage of Massachusetts politics for these many weeks. I wished to clear away if I could by my single voice — and I know it is rather a wild hope — I wished to clear away some of these suspicions, doubts, and misapprehensions with which our political atmosphere has been charged.

Mr. President, there is another friend whose fortunes concerned me very nearly when I was called upon to consider what should be done at this time. The acting governor of the Commonwealth (turning to Mr. Draper, who sat upon the platform) is a friend for whom I have a great regard, a great affection, which I trust and believe is returned. He is my friend, faithful and just to me. I want to have him elected next November, and not merely because I am eager for a party victory, although I desire that as much as any man. I want to have him elected

not merely because I think Republican success essential to the best interests of the Commonwealth, not merely because he is my friend, deep as that feeling is, but I want to have him elected because he is what he is, — a brave, courageous, high-minded man, who can look defeat in the face and watch departing votes with a smile, rather than sacrifice a principle to avoid the one or retain the other. If there is any possible obstacle that I can help to take away from his onward course, I would remove it. If there is a straw upon his path, I should like to brush it away.

One other friend I want to speak of, and then I will ask you to pardon me for having trespassed so long upon your attention. He is not a friend whose personal fortunes are concerned in what we do here this morning. But that which he holds much dearer than his own personal fortunes, the great policies, to the establishment of which he has given all that is best in him, are in a large measure at stake here to-day. He is my friend of many years, my close friend, my companion. I believe in him. A high destiny has called him to the greatest place in the republic, one of the greatest places on earth. He goes out of it, solely by his own compulsion, in less than a year, but he leaves his policies behind him. I have differed with him sometimes, sometimes I have felt obliged to vote against him. He is too high-minded, too large-minded a man to object to a difference of opinion. He would not like a servile subservience. He had rather have a friend who speaks out honestly, even if he differs; and if you cannot convince him, he will go his own way. He was charged when he came into power with being such a combative man that he was sure to involve the country in war; and he has been the greatest peacemaker of his time. It was

he who brought about peace between Russia and Japan. It was he who used his great influence for a peaceful solution of the question at Algeciras, which were at one time threatening to the peace of the whole world. It is he and his great Secretary of State, Mr. Root, who have promoted peace throughout South America. It is he who has done more to press forward the work of The Hague than any other man. It is he, more than any other man, who has built up a navy which is now the second in the world, and which in its long voyage has come to itself for the first time as a great fleet. That fleet and that voyage were great contributions to the peace of the United States and of the world.

But the President's greatest work is the work he has done here at home. He found a situation confronting him where the American people were stirred with indignation at wrongs which they believed to exist, and they did not know how those wrongs could be reached. The great mass of the conservative, law-abiding citizens, neither the very rich nor the very poor men, who constitute the strength of the republic, who are the backbone of the Republican party, were looking' about in alarm lest something should not be done to cure the evils and the corruptions which menaced us. If the President had paused, if he had not gone forward, that great body of American citizens would have been forced into the arms of the violent and the revolutionary. But it is he who satisfied them that the work would be done, that wrong should not be permitted to exist. He has given them what they wanted. He has stood between the radicals of reaction and the radicals of revolution ; and he has carried behind him the great mass of the American people.

After a time, when men look back on this period and

write its history, they will see that what we have had done for us was the work of a great constructive statesman; that the President has laid out a series of measures which, in substance, this country has adopted, or will adopt, to solve the problems which modern economic conditions have crowded upon us. And the people have followed him. The millions of dollars may be against him, but the millions of votes are with him. He is the best abused and the most popular man in the United States. He has been abused more than any President who ever sat in the White House, except Grant, Lincoln, and Washington; and he has a popularity to-day and the confidence of the American people to a degree never equaled by any President except Washington and Lincoln. The people understand. His enemies, however, have been powerful, if few. They have been vocal, if they have not been numerous, and they have left nothing undone to compass his defeat.

Why has that abuse been showered upon him? Read his messages, which many of those who condemn him fail to do, and you will find that the basic principles for which he stands are the principles upon which the American republic must stand, if it is to stand at all — principles which no man can successfully confute or deny. But he set himself to the task of rooting up certain evils strongly fastened in the soil, and when they were torn out they shrieked like the fabled mandrake when it was pulled from the earth. Those who profited by the evils and abuses did not like it, and thence have come the ferocious attacks upon him. Fault has been found with the violence of his expressions. His language has been considered at times too strong. You cannot call men to a fire in a whisper. When the pioneer breaks into the jungle and the forest, he has to use the broadaxe in order to clear

the great trees from his path. The pruning knife and the clipping shears are all very well in the ordered growth of a hundred years, or of many centuries of care under the hand of man. They are useless to the pioneer, who is breaking his way into the virgin forest. The man who was breaking into a system which had unconsciously grown up in our business world had to use strong language. It has been said that revolutions are not made with rosewater, and if you are going to force a great reform through against those who are intrenched against it, you cannot force it through with a delicate touch.

Mr. President, those policies which Theodore Roosevelt will bequeath to us on the 4th of March next, the Republican party alone can take up and carry forward to completion. There is not sanity enough in the Democratic party to do it, because when they nominate sane candidates they desert them, and when they select the "insane and unsafe" the voters fly from them. It is for us to follow the path which the President has marked out between the radicals of reaction on the one side and the radicals of revolution on the other. There is only one Republican who can be nominated at Chicago who can be defeated; and that is a Republican whose nomination would be hailed as a defeat of Theodore Roosevelt and his policies. There is only one way in which a Republican candidate can be defeated, and that is by factional fights among ourselves. I would have Massachusetts to-day to set the example of harmony and union so that she can make her opinion felt, and I would have her do it without wrong to any one, or mortification to any one, or hurt to any one. I would have her say to all her sister states: "There must be no factional fights among Republicans. The party must be united and harmonious, true to the

traditions of the past and united on the principles of the present administration." When we are thus united and harmonious, the victory is always with us. The Republican party is never beaten when its members march in unison. In the interest of a wise progress, in the interest of the maintenance of those policies which we all have at heart, which we have approved in our resolutions—there never was a time when party union was more necessary.

There is no man in this country who believes more thoroughly than I do in Theodore Roosevelt and his policies. I would cut off my hand sooner than do anything to injure him. No one who knows me can doubt the sincerity or earnestness of my declared preference among presidential candidates. You may believe, therefore, that when I urge upon you this union of hearts and union of hands in the work which is coming to us, I do it as an ardent friend and supporter of the present administration.

I am sure that when I speak as I do, when I urge you to accept the solution reached by the resolutions committee, I am speaking not only in the interests of our party here, but also in the interest of the larger party which covers every state; not only in the interests of those friends of mine whom I have named to you and to whom I would render every service in my power, but I am speaking, I believe, in the interests of that great party of the nation in whose hands alone I firmly believe the future of that nation is safely to be trusted.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN NA-
TIONAL CONVENTION AT CHICAGO.

JUNE 17, 1908.

SPEECH BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION AT CHICAGO.

JUNE 17, 1908.

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: I thank you most sincerely for the great honor you have done me in choosing me to preside over your deliberations. For it is a great honor to be the presiding officer of a Republican national convention. I can conceive of conventions — I have, indeed, heard of conventions, where the honor of such a post as that now occupied by me is dubious, and where, if excitement is present, pleasure is conspicuous by its absence. But to be the presiding officer of a Republican convention is ever a high distinction to which no man can be insensible. Gentlemen of the convention, again I thank you.

I shall not delay or detain you with many words. Your resolutions will set forth the principles of the party and declare the policies upon which we shall ask for the support of the people of the United States. With fullness and with eloquence your temporary chairman already has reviewed the history of the party, has given you account of what has been done, and has set forth what we hope and mean to do. My duty is merely to aid you, so far as I can, in the orderly and prompt transaction of the business which has brought us together. That business

is momentous, — nothing less than to name here the two men who, speaking with the simplicity of truth, will be the next President and Vice-President of the United States. In order to win for them, and for our party, an assured as well as merited victory, we must defeat our opponents, whose exclusion from power is desired by the country and deserved by them.

No other political party in modern times can show such a record of achievement during the last fifty years as the Republican party. Upon that record we can stand and challenge all comers to the lists. But it is well to remember that the actual test we have to meet is much less severe. This is a comparative world. We do not go forth to contest the great prize with an ideal party, which we sometimes see beautifully depicted by persons of self-confessed superiority and chronic discontent. The glittering abstraction which they present never existed yet on sea or land. It gleams upon us in printers' ink, but it has neither substance nor organization nor candidates; for organizations and candidates must be taken from the ranks of men, and cannot be the floating phantoms of an uneasy dream.

The American people must choose next November between us and the Democratic party. With the Democratic party, and with that alone, must the comparison be made. We differ from that party in some important particulars. We both, it is true, have a past and a history, but we treat those possessions very differently. They wish to keep their past a profound secret. We seek by all means to publish ours to the world. If we refer to their history, they charge us with calumny. We regard ours, truthful and undistorted, as our greatest glory. To the youth of the country they say: "Judge us solely by

our undiscovered future." We say: "Read our record, judge us by our past and our present, and from these learn what we are — what we have been and what we mean to be." Recall the cries which have sounded from the lips of these two parties during the last half-century. On the one side, "Slavery; secession; repudiation of the public debt; fiat money; free trade; free silver; the overthrow of the courts, and government ownership."

On the Republican side, "Free soil; free men; the Union; the payment of the debt; honest money; protection to American industry; the gold standard; the maintenance of law, of order, and of the courts, and the government regulation of great corporations." The old shibboleths of the Democrats are to-day the epitaphs of policies which are dead and damned. They serve only to remind us of dangers escaped, or to warn us of perils to be shunned. The battle cries of the Republicans have been the watchwords of great causes. They tell of victories won and triumphs tasted; they are embodied in the laws and mark the stepping-stones by which the republic has risen to ever greater heights of power and prosperity.

As we thus call up the past, and the echoes of these old conflicts again sound in our ears and touch the chords of memory, one great fact stands forth, clear and shining. The Republican party never has failed except when it has faltered. Our long career of victory, so rarely broken, has been due to our meeting boldly each question as it arose, to our facing every danger, as it crossed our path, with entire courage, fearless of consequence, and determined only to be true to the principles which brought the party into existence and to the spirit which has inspired it from its birth. We faced secession rather than assent

to the extension of slavery. Rather than submit to secession we took up the dread burden of civil war. But a few years ago we permitted thousands of Republicans to leave us, thereby imperiling our political power, rather than abandon the gold standard and plunge the country into disaster and dishonor.

In these latest years, as in the most remote, we have been true to our traditions. In the process of development a point was reached where the country was confronted by a situation more perilous than any it has ever faced except in the Civil War, and we Republicans were, therefore, obliged to deal with problems of the most complex and difficult character. To our honor, be it said, we have not shrunk from the task. Much has been done; much, no doubt, still remains to do; but the great underlying principles have been established, and upon them we can build, as necessity arises, carefully and deliberately.

I have spoken of the seriousness of the situation with which the country was confronted. Its gravity can hardly be overestimated. It grew out of conditions and was the result of forces beyond the control of men. Science and invention, the two great factors in this situation, have not only altered radically human environment and our relations to nature, but, in their application, they have also revolutionized economic conditions. These changed economic conditions have, in turn, affected profoundly society and politics. They have led, among other things, to combinations of capital and labor, on a scale and with a power never before witnessed. They have opened the way to accumulations of wealth in masses beyond the dreams of avarice and never before contemplated by men. The social and political problems thus created are wholly new. It is a fallacy to suppose that because the elements are old the

problem itself must, therefore, differ only in degree from those which have gone before. The elements may be old, but the problem presented by a change in the proportion of the elements may be, and in this case is, entirely new. Great individual fortunes and rich men are, it is true, as old as recorded history. Nearly two thousand years ago the tax farmers of Rome formed a "trust" for their own profit and protection; the English people three centuries ago revolted against the patents and monopolies granted by Elizabeth and James to their courtiers and monopolists; forestallers and speculators in the necessities of life were a curse in our Revolution and were bitterly denounced by Washington. Yet, it is none the less true that the same things to-day present questions different in kind as well as in degree from their predecessors. It is the huge size of private fortunes, the vast extent and power of modern combinations of capital, made possible by present conditions, which have brought upon us, in these later years, problems portentous in their possibilities, and threatening not only our social and political welfare, but even our personal freedom, if they are not boldly met and wisely solved.

The great body of the American people, neither very rich nor very poor; the honest, the thrifty, the hard-working; the men and women who earn and save, have no base envy, no fanatic hatred of wealth, whether individual or corporate, if it has been honestly gained and is wisely and generously employed with a sense of responsibility to the public. But this great body of our people, by habit and instinct alike wisely conservative, these people, who are the bone and sinew of our country, and upon whom its fortunes and its safety rest, began to observe, with deep alarm, the recent manifestations of the new economic con-

ditions. More and more they came to believe that these vast fortunes and these huge combinations of capital were formed and built up by tortuous and dishonest means, and through a cynical disregard of the very laws which the mass of the people were compelled to obey. They began to fear that political power was being reft from their hands and put into possession of the money holders, that their dearest rights were in danger, that their hopes of success and advancement were cut off by business systems which they could not understand but in which the individual was sacrificed and held down. To those who looked beneath the surface, an ominous unrest was apparent. The violent counsels of violent men, who aimed at the destruction of property and the overthrow of law, began to be heard and hearkened to. The great order-loving, industrious masses of the American people turned away from these advocates of violence, but, at the same time, demanded that their government should give them, in lawful and reasonable ways, the protection to which they were entitled, against the dangers they justly apprehended.

The grave duty of fulfilling these righteous demands, like all the great public services of the last half-century, was imposed upon the Republican party, and it has not flinched from the burden. Under the lead of the President, the Republican party has grappled with the new problems, born of the new conditions. It has been no light task. Dangerous extremes threatened on either hand. On the one side were the radicals of reaction, who resisted any change at all; on the other side were the radicals of destruction, who wished to change everything. These two forms of radicalism are as far apart at the outset as the poles, but when carried out they lead alike to revolution. Between these two extremes the Republican

President and the Republican Congress were compelled to steer, and, while they advanced steadily, soberly, and effectively, they were obliged to repel the radical assaults on either hand. Yet, notwithstanding all these difficulties, much has been accomplished. The response of the people to the policies urged by the President has been so emphatic that it has been made clear, once for all, that the government of the United States is never to be dominated by money and financial interests, and that the political party which permits itself to be ruled by them is thereby doomed to defeat.

The policy of the Republican party in dealing with these new and formidable questions, which have taken concrete form in enormous combinations of capital and in great public service corporations, has been formulated and determined. That policy is to use government regulation and supervision for the control of corporations and combinations, so that these great and necessary instruments of commerce and business may be preserved as useful servants, and not destroyed because they have threatened to become dangerous masters. This policy is the absolute opposite of government ownership and all like measures, advocated by our opponents, which tend directly to socialism and to all its attendant miseries and evils. It is in pursuance of this policy, shaped and settled during the last few years, that old laws have been enforced and new ones enacted.

Nothing is more destructive to the respect for law — the chief bulwark of civilized society — than to place laws upon the statute book in order merely to still public clamor and satisfy the people, but which it is never intended to enforce. The worst laws imaginable are those which are allowed to rust, unused, because, if enforced,

they might interfere with vested abuses or curb the rich and powerful. The President has enforced the laws as he found them on the statute book. For this performance of his sworn duty he has been bitterly attacked. It was to be expected. Vested abuses and profitable wrongs cry out loudly when their intrenchments are carried, and some one is sure to be hurt when the bayonets of the law are pushed home. In the great American electorate money has few votes, but it can command many voices and cause many birds to sing. The result is that the President is the best abused and the most popular man in the United States to-day. He has been more abused than any President except Washington, Lincoln, and Grant. He possesses the love and confidence of the American people to a degree never equaled except by Lincoln and Washington. May it not be said, in sober truth, that the fearless performance of a sworn duty is not without its exceeding great reward?

• But the work has not ceased with the enforcement of existing laws. A Republican Congress and a Republican President have placed new laws upon the statute books, designed to carry out the Republican policy of government regulation in a safe, reasonable, and effective manner. The Elkins law, aimed at preferential rebates, which have been the curse of our transportation and our business; the railroad rate law, which made the supervision of railroads more effective; and the pure food law, which has been, in the highest degree, beneficent to the masses of our people, are all monuments of the policy and the labors of the Republican party.

The President, who has led his party and the people in this great work, retires, by his own determination, from his high office, on the 4th of March next. His refusal of

a renomination, dictated by the loftiest motives and by a noble loyalty to American traditions, is final and irrevocable. Any one who attempts to use his name as a candidate for the presidency impugns both his sincerity and his good faith, two of the President's greatest and most conspicuous qualities, upon which no shadow has ever been cast. That man is no friend to Theodore Roosevelt, and does not cherish his name and fame, who now, from any motive, seeks to urge him as a candidate for the great office which he has finally declined. The President has refused what his countrymen would gladly have given him; he says what he means and means what he says, and his party and his country will respect his wishes as they honor his high character and great public service.

But, although the President retires, he leaves his policies behind him. To those policies the Republican party stands pledged. We must carry them out, as we have begun, regardless alike of the radicals of reactions and the radicals of revolution. We must hold fast to that which is good while we make the advances which the times demand.

We ask for the confidence and support of the American people, because we have met the problems of the day and have tried patiently to solve them. We appeal for votes and for the power they confer, because we uphold the President's policies and shall continue to sustain them. We make our appeal with confidence, because we have a well-defined policy, and are not, like our opponents, fumbling in the dark to find some opinion on something.

We believe in the maintenance of law and order, and in the support of the courts in all their rights and dignity. We believe in equal rights for all men, and are opposed to special privileges for any man or any class of men,

high or low, rich or poor. We, who established the gold standard, are pledged to the cause of sound finance. We stand for protection to American industry and American labor, and we will resist all the assaults of free trade under whatever name it comes disguised.

We will see to the defense of the country. We mean to have a navy worthy of the American name. We seek peace and friendship with all the nations, but alliance with none. Yet we have no intention of being a "hermit nation." The great services of the President to the world's peace will be continued by the party which he has led.

We are a party fit to rule and govern, to legislate and administer, and not a fortuitous collection of atoms whose only form of thought or motion is to oppose. Above all, we are true to our traditions and to our past. True now, as we were in the days of Lincoln.

In this spirit we must prevail ; by this sign we must conquer.

WILLIAM B. ALLISON.

SPEECH IN THE SENATE,
FEBRUARY 6, 1909.

WILLIAM B. ALLISON.

MR. PRESIDENT: Advancing years impose their penalties upon every man. In their silent action there is a terrible certainty and an unsparing equality of distribution, but among all their warnings, among all the milestones which they place to mark the passage of time, none is more mournful than the task of reading the letters and biographies of those whom we have known and loved, or the sad duty which compels us to utter in public our words of praise and affection for the friends, the companions, the long-trusted leaders who have gone. Yet all these trials must be faced, as we look into the eyes of Fate or listen to its knocking at the door. All that we can do is to meet them seriously and solemnly, yet in the right spirit, without empty and helpless lamentation. The death of Senator Allison has brought these familiar thoughts to my mind, old thoughts, indeed, yet ever new, and recurring lately with a painful frequency as I reflected what a long and affectionate friendship was ended, what a blank space was suddenly made in my daily life by his departure.

I recall with great vividness my first meeting with Senator Allison at dinner in 1874, at the house of Mr. Samuel Hooper, a distinguished Member of Congress representing one of the Boston districts. The party was a small one, consisting only of our host, his nephew, myself,

Senator Conkling, and Senator Allison. I was a boy just out of college, and Mr. Allison appeared to me a person of great age and dignity. As a matter of fact, he was only forty-five, which seems to me now quite young, and he had but just begun that career in the Senate which was destined to prove so long and so memorable. Mr. Hooper's nephew, a classmate and lifelong friend of mine, and I sat by and listened to all that was said that evening with deep and silent interest. The talk was very good and well worth listening to. To those who remember the men, it is needless to say that Mr. Conkling took the unquestioned lead in the conversation, and that when he criticised, as he frequently did, he spared no one. Young men, without much thought of the pain or injustice which may be inflicted, enjoy sarcasm and satire and wit at the expense of others. Youth is not, as a rule, a tender-hearted period, and Mr. Conkling showed plenty of sport in discussing not only his enemies but those whom Cosimo dei Medici declared were more to be feared by every man, — his friends. Mr. Allison himself did not escape. My remembrance of Mr. Conkling and of the character of his talk is very sharp and clear, and that is all. My recollection of Senator Allison is equally distinct, but it brings with it a gentle memory of the kindness of a distinguished and much older man to a young fellow whom he never expected to see again, of a sense of humor as kindly as it was keen, of a good nature which took even Mr. Conkling's gibes with a quiet dignity and easy patience, very pleasant to witness and very pleasant still to recall. Perhaps it is not unprofitable to remember these things, for I think that among the qualities manifested that evening, thirty-five years ago, a lesson in good manners, in self-restraint, and in personal dignity, might be

discovered without undue delving. I have spoken of this little incident, quite unimportant except to myself, because the qualities which I then saw, as I thought, in Mr. Allison were really among his most conspicuous attributes. He did not wear his heart upon his sleeve, but his gentleness, his humor, his innate kindliness, were as apparent to the casual and humble stranger as to those who knew him best. He did not cover them with austerity, solemnity, or pomposity, and reserve them only for the benefit of the leading actors upon the great stage where his life was passed, but he gave them freely to all the world, and made the world thereby, so far as his influence went, a happier place to live in.

After I came to Washington it was my good fortune to know Senator Allison better while I was still in the House, and for fifteen years I have seen him constantly and intimately every day of each session. The nearer view changed in no respect, although it enhanced what my first brief glance of him had revealed. But years of a common service disclosed to me that which I had only dimly perceived before, his qualities as a public man and as a statesman; for he was universally admitted to deserve the latter title long before the last hard condition which turns a successful politician into a statesman, as pointed out by Mr. Speaker Reed, had been fulfilled. It is of Mr. Allison in this capacity that I desire to speak to-day. Others here will trace the stages of his career and recount his services better than I. His life will be told by his biographers in the time to come with adequate materials and in the ample historical proportions which it so well deserves. My purpose is a very modest one, merely to attempt to give my impression of Mr. Allison as a statesman, and of the type of public man which he presented

in his long, useful, and honorable service of more than forty years. That service was crowded with incessant work, for no more industrious, no more conscientious man ever lived. The hardest suffering of his last year was the sense that he could not do all the work which pertained to his high position as he had been wont to do it. The great measures to which, as the years passed by, his name was attached, would be an imposing list; and if we were to add to this those in which he had a large, shaping, and even controlling part, it would fill pages of our record. His monument as a lawmaker, a great function when properly fulfilled, is to be found in the statutes and the history of the United States during the last forty years. But his most valuable work, if we would look at it as a whole, as his personal contribution to the welfare of his fellow beings, is not conspicuous in the printed pages of books of laws or books of history, now that he is dead, any more than it was in the mouths of men while he was living. To value him rightly we must understand the Senate and its daily work. The brilliant oration, the violent diatribe, the coarse invective, the vulgar abuse, are spread in large letters and in long columns before the public eye; and except in the case of a really great speech, contributing to the settlement of a great question, they fade as quickly as the tints of the rainbow on the breaking wave, and are rarely able to find in the days when the account is made up even the slight remembrance of a historian's footnote. No mistake is commoner than that which confuses notoriety with fame. Fame may be the last infirmity of noble minds, but it is built upon the rock of deeds done, while notoriety is always fleeting and generally vulgar. Mr. Allison's fame rests securely not only upon the great historic measures in which he

had a leading share, but upon his steady work done here day by day, quietly, diligently, thoroughly, without the glare of headlines, for the most part unobserved and largely unappreciated by the American people, who profited so greatly by its results. The Senator from Maine [Mr. Hale] has a favorite phrase of description in regard to some of those who have served here or who serve here now. When he would praise highly, he says such a man is "a good Senator." This has nothing to do with character or disposition, or with virtue, public or private, but means that a Senator does the work of the Senate well — the work of carrying on the government, of advancing good measures and arresting bad ones, the obscure work, the essential work, in which there is much labor and little glory, and which demands constant attendance and unflagging attention. Tried by this exacting test, who would hesitate to say that for many years Mr. Allison was our best Senator?

He was a party leader, a wise adviser, and a framer of policies, but he was also, and above all, one of the men who carry on the government. They are not many at any time, and they are absolutely essential at all times. In the midst of political strife, in the tumult which attends the rise and fall of parties, to use the English phrase, "The King's Government must be carried on." Whatever storm may rage, however bitter and loud may be the strife of contending factions, the public debts must be paid, national credit maintained, the army and navy kept on a proper footing, the mails must be delivered, and the revenue collected. No matter what happens, some one must be at work *ohne Hast, ohne Rast* to see that these things are done in due season. Macaulay has said that Attila did not conduct his campaigns on exchequer bills, but we

do ; and what is more important, we maintain the orderly movement of our government in that way from day to day. It is a heavy burden, and the country owes much to those who bear it. This was Mr. Allison's task during more than the lifetime of a generation. Beyond any one in our time, perhaps beyond any one in our history, did he bear this great responsibility, and he never failed in his duty. For thirty-six years a member of the Committee on Appropriations, for twenty-five years its chairman, he became a sort of permanent chancellor of the exchequer. In the long list of eminent men who have filled that great office in England, there is not one who has surpassed him in knowledge of his subject, in the dexterity and skill with which he drafted laws and reconciled conflicting views, in financial ability, or in the strength of capacity with which he gauged the sources of revenue and adjusted expenditures to income. No one ever applied to him the cheap title of "watchdog of the Treasury," whose glory comes merely from barking so as to split the ears of the groundlings, and whose niggard and unenlightened resistance to every expenditure, no matter how meritorious, usually causes enormous and increased outlay in the end. Mr. Allison was too great as well as too experienced a man to think parsimony was statesmanship, and not to know that a wise liberality was as a rule the truest economy of the public money.

Very few persons, even here, realize what labor, what knowledge, what experience he brought to his work. We saw a great bill reported, we watched him handle it with a tact and skill which I have never seen equaled, we noted that he was familiar with every item and could answer every question, and we were satisfied with the outcome and did not pause to consider what it all meant. To

achieve this result implied a minute knowledge of every branch of the government and every detail of expenditure, which had cost days and nights of labor and years of experience. Scrupulous honesty, of course, was his; but that would have gone but a short distance without the trained intelligence, the unswerving diligence, the disciplined mind, which controlled the disposition of the millions upon millions that passed unscathed through his strong, clean hands. Moreover, he was always here. The standing joke about his caution and his avoidance of unqualified statement, which no one enjoyed more than he, grew out of certain temperamental attributes. But it is well to remember that, however guarded he was in speech, he never failed to vote, which is the real and final index of political courage and of constancy of opinion and conviction. He may have put clauses of limitation into what he said, but he never shrank from, never evaded, a vote.

Presidents and cabinets, Speakers and House chairmen, came and went, but he remained at his post, until we regarded him in the field of finance and appropriation almost, as was said of Webster, like an institution of the country. Six times did the legislature of Iowa elect him to the Senate. Pride in the State, pride in him, and personal affection counted for much in their action; but I cannot but think that they realized also their responsibility to the country which prized so highly the services of their Senator. It is the fashion, just now, to decry legislatures; but we shall wait long before we find any form of election which will represent as truly the real will, not only of the people of a state, but of the people of all the states, as did the legislature of Iowa during those thirty-six years. It will be a sorry day for government and people alike when we lose that permanence and continu-

ity, that directing and guiding force, which such careers and such service as Mr. Allison's have given to the Senate. It is such careers as his which have made the Senate what it has been in our history; and if, under pretense of making it more popular, we are subjected to schemes which open the door wide to those who would commit fraud and to those who would spend money without stint, we shall not only see the popular will distorted, travestied, and defeated, but the country will be deprived of the long-continued services of such men as Mr. Allison, which have been and are of inestimable value to the United States.

Where, then, shall we rank him? To put him out of or above the class to which he rightfully belongs would not be the part of love and affection, but of vain eulogy, which perishes with the breath which utters it. He did not stand in the class with Lincoln, savior of the state, greatest, as an English historian has said, of all the figures of the nineteenth century. He did not reach that lonely height. Nor was he one of the class of men like Bismarck and Cavour, builders of nations, relentless wielders of armies, masters of all the subtle arts of diplomacy. Mr. Allison belongs to the type of statesmen of which the history of the English-speaking race furnishes, happily, many examples. They are men who carry on the government, and who have made possible the practical success of free representative institutions. Wise, far-seeing, prudent, devoted to their country, and abounding in good sense, they command by their absolute honesty and capacity the entire confidence of senates and parliaments. Among the chief statesmen of this class Mr. Allison holds his high place. Such a verdict as this may at this moment sound cold, but it has one great merit,

that of truth, and the more we consider it the more we shall understand what high praise it carries with it.

We Americans take great pride in our country, and no people has better cause for pride. In no country is patriotism more intense. We never hesitate to give expression to our love of country under all conditions, sometimes with a vehemence which tends to make others think that we doubt our own sincerity, and with a disregard of time and place which outsiders, at least, are prone to deem crude and tasteless. Yet, although it sounds like a paradox, we are at the same time curiously distrustful of ourselves, and seem almost void of self-confidence in judging the work of Americans. We oscillate between the extremes of unintelligent laudation, given merely because that which we praise is American, and trembling hesitation in awarding proper place to real achievement. The higher we rise in the scale of intelligence and education, the more timid we seem to become; and we look over our shoulders and criticise and even sneer at American performance because, apparently, we feel that we may be laughed at by somebody, or because we suspect that we are something apart from and beneath the standards of the civilized world. For no better reason than that we have at times praised foolishly and extravagantly, we are shy of praising rightly and justly. We shrank away from Walt Whitman until men like Rossetti and Symonds and Stevenson and Swinburne had spoken, and then we only slowly acknowledged that the Long Island carpenter was a great poet, and one who had become a real and original force in the splendid annals of English verse. As with the poet, so with the painter and sculptor, the writer and the statesman. We yield easily to the provincial temptation to hail with exultation the heaven-born genius, who generally

never justifies his title, and we doubt and hesitate and pause in giving due place to the work of a lifetime, deep-founded on all that is best in our inheritance, slowly and painfully built up by talents steadily applied and by sacrifice of self to a noble purpose.

If Mr. Allison had done the work and held the place in England which he did and held here, his memoirs would appear in fit and stately volumes, like those which recount the life of the late Lord Granville, whom Mr. Allison resembled in service and character, although the fields of their activity were different. Had he been a great English statesman, as he was a great American statesman, his statue would have its place here in the Capitol, the scene of his labors; as at Westminster we find the statues of English prime ministers and parliamentary leaders, many of whom Mr. Allison surpassed in all that goes to make a statesman. I trust that this may yet be done; but I greatly fear that we shall go on adding to the freaks in marble and to the effigies of the temporarily illustrious, which now crowd against those of some of our really great men, and only serve to disfigure one of the most beautiful rooms which modern architecture has given to the world. I say all this of Mr. Allison, not in the beaten way of eulogy or tribute, but because I wished, by historical standards and, so far as possible, with the coolness of history, to vindicate the place of a man who was a great public servant, a statesman as eminent as he was modest, and to whom this country owes a large debt, not merely for his lifelong labors, but for the example he set to us all and the dignity he gave to the Government of the United States.

And yet, when everything has been said, strive as hard as we may to govern ourselves by the tests of history and to award to Mr. Allison the place which was rightfully his,

and which all men should acknowledge, at the end it is the man of whom we think to-day and not the Senator. His death meant a personal loss to each of us. His abilities, his honesty, his unstinted devotion to the country, his fine character, his keen sense of humor, we do well to tell them over. He fully deserves it all. But what history or posterity cannot feel or know, is the one thing we feel most and know best. He inspired love and affection. He was beloved by all who knew him, and to us here his death leaves a blank which cannot be filled. Great powers were his, but the greatest of all his attributes was that kind, warm heart, that goodness to others, which cast a spell over every one who came within his influence.

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE OF
MASSACHUSETTS, FEBRUARY 12, 1909.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, YOUR EXCELLENCY, SENATORS, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: By your kind request I am here. An invitation from you is to me a command, which it is at once an honor and a pleasure to obey. But in thus honoring me you have suddenly imposed upon me a duty, which it is not easy worthily to fulfill. You have asked me to address you upon this, the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln; to express for you and to you some of the thoughts which ought to find utterance when, on the completion of the century, we seek to pay fit homage to the memory of that great man.

I know not how it may be with the many others who, in these days of commemoration, will speak of Lincoln, but to me the dominant feeling, as I approach my subject, is a sense of helplessness, and a sharp realization of the impossibility of doing justice to such an occasion. To attempt here a review of his life would be labor lost. Ten stately volumes by those who lived in closest communion with him, and who knew him best, were not more than adequate to tell fitly the story of his life. That story too, in varying form, is known to all the people, "familiar in their mouths as household words." From the early days of dire poverty, from the log cabin of the shiftless pioneer, ever moving forward in search of a fortune which never

came, from the picture of the boy working his sums or reading his Bible and his Milton by the red light of the fire, the marvelous tale goes onward and upward to the solemn scene of the second inaugural, and to the burial of the great chief amid the lamentations of a nation. We know it all, and the story is one of the great treasures of the American people.

Still more impossible would it be in a brief moment here to draw, even in the barest outline, a sketch of the events in which his was the commanding presence, for that would be to write the history of the United States during the most crowded and most terrible years of our existence as a nation. Yet if Lincoln's life and deeds, by their very magnitude, thus exclude us from any attempt even to enumerate them, there is, nevertheless, something still better which we can do upon this day, forever made memorable by his birth. We can render to him what I venture to think is the truest homage, that which I believe he would prize most, and compared to which any other is little more than lip service. We can pause to-day in the hurry of daily life and contemplate that great, lonely, tragic figure, that imagination with its touch of the poet, that keen, strong mind with its humor and its pathos, that splendid common sense and pure character, and then learn from the life which the possessor of all these qualities lived, and from the deeds which he did, lessons which may not be without value to each one of us in our own lives, in teaching us the service which we should render to our country. Let me express my meaning, with slight variation, in his own immortal words: —

The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what he did here. It is for us, the

living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which he who fought here has thus far so nobly advanced.

In this spirit I am about to suggest a few thoughts among the many which have come to me as I have meditated upon the life of Abraham Lincoln, and upon what, with that great theme before me, I should say to you to-day.

I desire first, if I can, to take you back for a moment to the living man, and thereby show you what some of his trials were and how he met them, for in doing so I believe we can learn better how to deal with our own problems. I think, too, that if we thus look upon him with considerate eyes, we shall be inspired to seek, in public affairs, for more charitable and better instructed judgments upon public men and public events than are common now. We are apt, unconsciously and almost inevitably, to confuse in our minds the Lincoln of to-day, the Lincoln of history, as he dwells in our hearts and our imaginations, with the actual man who was President of the United States in the dark days of the Civil War, and who struggled forward amid difficulties greater, almost, than any ever encountered by a leader of men.

Mankind has never lost its capacity for weaving myths, or its inborn love for them. This faculty, or rather this innate need of human nature, is apparent in the earliest pages of human history. The beautiful and tragic myths, born of the Greek imagination, which have inspired poets and dramatists for three thousand years, come to us out of the dim past with the light of a roseate dawn upon them. They come to us alike in the great verse of Homer and veiled in the gray mists of the north, where we descry the shadows of fighting men and hear the clash of swords and

the wild screams of the Valkyries. The leaders of tribes, the founders of states, the eponymous and autochthonous heroes in the infancy of civilization were all endowed by the popular imagination with a divine descent and a near kinship to the gods. We do not give our heroes godlike ancestors, although I have seen a book which traces the pedigree of Washington to Odin; but when they are great enough we transmute the story of their lives into a myth, just like the Greeks and the Norsemen. Do not imagine from this that I am about to tell you of the "real" or the "true" Lincoln. Nothing would be more alien to my purpose, or more distasteful; for I have observed that, as a rule, when these words are prefixed to the subject of a biography, it usually means that we have spread before us a collection of petty details and unworthy gossip, which presents an utterly distorted view of a great man, which is, in substance, entirely false, and which gratifies only those envious minds which like to see superiority brought down to their own level. Such presentations are as ignoble and base as the popular myth, however erroneous, is loving and beautiful, — a manifestation of that noble quality in human nature which Carlyle has described in his "Hero Worship." I wish merely to detach Lincoln from the myth, which has possession of us all, that his wisdom, his purity, and his greatness were as obvious and acknowledged, or ought to have been as obvious and acknowledged, in his lifetime as they are to-day. We have this same feeling about the one man in American history who stands beside Lincoln in unchallenged equality of greatness. Washington, indeed, is so far removed that we have lost our conception of the fact that he was bitterly criticised, that he struggled with many difficulties, and that his words, which to us have an almost sacred

significance, were, when they were uttered, treated by some persons then extant with contempt. Let me give you an idea of what certain people, now quite forgotten, thought of Washington when he went out of office. On the 6th of March, 1797, the leading newspaper of the opposition spoke as follows:—

“Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace” was the pious ejaculation of a pious man who beheld a flood of happiness rushing in upon mankind. If ever there was a time that would license the reiteration of the ejaculation, that time has now arrived; for the man who is the source of all the misfortunes of our country is this day reduced to a level with his fellow citizens, and is no longer possessed of power to multiply evils upon the United States. If ever there was a period for rejoicing, this is the moment. Every heart in unison with the freedom and happiness of the people ought to beat high with exultation that the name of Washington ceases from this day to give currency to political insults and to legalized corruption. A new era is now opening upon us, — an era which promises much to the people; for public measures must now stand upon their own merits, and nefarious projects can no longer be supported by a name. When a retrospect has been taken of the Washington administration for eight years, it is a subject of the greatest astonishment that a single individual should have cankered the principles of Republicanism in an enlightened people just emerging from the gulf of despotism, and should have carried his designs against the public liberty so far as to have put in jeopardy its very existence. Such, however, are the facts, and with these staring us in the face, the day ought to be a jubilee in the United States.

How strange and unreal this sounds to us who know not merely that George Washington led the army of the United States to victory, but that his administration established our Union and our government, which Lincoln,

leading the American people, was destined to preserve. The myth has grown so powerful that it is hard to comprehend that actual living men were uttering words like these about George Washington.

The same feeling in regard to Lincoln began to take form even earlier than in the case of Washington. The manner of his death made men see, as by a flash of lightning, what he was and what he had done, even before the grave closed over him. Nothing illustrates the violent revulsion of sentiment which then occurred better than the verses which appeared in "Punch" when the news of his death reached England. He had been jeered at, abused, vilified, and caricatured in England to a degree which can be understood only by those who lived through that time, or who have turned over the newspapers and magazines, or read the memoirs and diaries of that epoch. In this chorus of abuse "Punch" had not lagged behind. Then came the assassination, and then these verses by Tom Taylor, written to accompany Tenniel's cartoon representing England laying a wreath on Lincoln's bier:—

Beside this corpse, that bears for winding sheet
The Stars and Stripes he lived to rear anew,
Between the mourners at his head and feet,
Say, scurril jester, is there room for you?

Yes, he had lived to shame me from my sneer,
To lame my pencil and confute my pen;
To make me own this hind of princes peer,
This rail-splitter a true born king of men.

How, at a glance, we see not only the greatness and nobility of the man, forcing themselves upon the minds of men abroad as at home, but how keenly these remorseful verses make us realize the storm of abuse, of criticism, and defamation through which he had passed to victory.

From that day to this the tide of feeling has swept on, until, with Lincoln as with Washington, we have become unable, without a serious effort, to realize the attacks which he met, the assaults which were made upon him, or the sore trials which he had to endure. I would fain show you how the actual man, living in those terrible years, met one or two of the attacks.

Lincoln believed that the first step toward the salvation of the Union was to limit the area of secession. He wished above all things, therefore, to hold in the Union the Border States, as they were then called. If those states were added to the Confederacy, the chances of saving the Union would have been seriously diminished. In those same states there was a strong Union feeling and a very weak anti-slavery feeling. If they could be convinced that the controlling purpose of the war was to preserve the Union, the chances were that they could be held; but if they were made to believe that the real object of the war was the abolition of slavery, they would probably have been lost. Lincoln, therefore, had checked Fremont in issuing orders for the liberation of the slaves, and in the first year of the war had done nothing in that direction, for reasons which seemed to him good, and which, to all men to-day, appear profoundly wise. Abolitionists and extreme anti-slavery men everywhere were bitterly disappointed, and a flood of criticism was let loose upon him for his attitude in this matter, while at the same time he was also abused by reactionaries and by the opposition as a "radical" and "black Republican." Horace Greeley, an able editor and an honest man, devoted to the cause of the Union, but a lifelong and ardent opponent of slavery, assailed the President in the New York "Tribune." Here is Lincoln's reply: —

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, Aug. 22, 1862.

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave any one in doubt.

I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be "the Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe that what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I believe doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have here stated my purpose according to my view of official duty; and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free.

What a reply that is! Using his unrivaled power of statement, he sets forth his policy with a force which drives opposition helpless before it and renders retort impossible. He strips the issue bare of every irrelevant consideration, and makes it so plain that no one can mistake it.

This was a case of specific criticism. There were others of a more general nature. A few months after

Greeley wrote, Mr. Lincoln received a letter from Mr. Carl Schurz. Mr. Schurz, who has been a familiar figure to the present generation, was an able man and a very eloquent and effective speaker, especially upon economic subjects. He was also fond of criticising other people who were doing work for which they were responsible and not he. His system of criticism was a simple one. He would depict an ideal President, or Cabinet officer, or Senator; put him in an ideal situation, surrounded by conditions as they ought to be, and with this imaginary person he would then contrast, most unfavorably, the actual man who was trying to get results out of conditions which were not at all as they ought to be, but which, as a matter of fact, actually existed. This method of discussion, of course, presented Mr. Schurz in a very admirable light, and gave him a great reputation, especially with people who had never been called upon to bear any public responsibility at all. When Mr. Schurz was in the Cabinet himself he fell easily into the class which he criticised, and, naturally, bore no relation to the ideal by which he tried other people; but that fact never altered the opinion of his greatness entertained by his admirers. They liked to hear him find fault pointedly and eloquently with their contemporaries, but they forgot or overlooked the fact that in the past he had applied his system to Lincoln, and in that connection the process seems less convincing. Here is Lincoln's reply to Mr. Schurz's criticism: —

WASHINGTON, NOV. 24, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR, — I have just received and read your letter of the 20th. The purport of it is that we lost the late elections and the administration is failing because the war is unsuccessful, and that I must not flatter myself that I am not justly to blame for it. I certainly know that, if the war fails, the administration

fails, and that I will be blamed for it, whether I deserve it or not. And I ought to be blamed, if I could do better. You think I could do better; therefore you blame me already. I think I could not do better; therefore I blame you for blaming me. I understand you now to be willing to accept the help of men who are not Republicans, provided they have "heart in it." Agreed. I want no others. But who is to be the judge of hearts, or of "heart in it"? If I must discard my own judgment and take yours, I must also take that of others; and by the time I should reject all I should be advised to reject, I should have none left, Republicans or others, — not even yourself. For be assured, my dear sir, there are men who have "heart in it" that think you are performing your part as poorly as you think I am performing mine.

In these two letters which I have quoted lie great lessons. There is not a man to-day whose judgment would be of any value, who does not know that Lincoln, in these instances, was absolutely right, and his critics hopelessly and ignorantly wrong. They teach us that a great executive officer, dealing with the most momentous problems, cannot do everything at once; that he must subordinate the lesser to the greater if he would not fail entirely; that he must do the best he can, and not lose all by striving vainly for the ideally best. He must steer, also, between the radical extremists on the one side and the reactionary extremists on the other, — no easy task, and one which Lincoln performed with a perfection rarely seen among men. Lincoln could have said, with absolute truth, as Seneca's Pilot says, in Montaigne's paraphrase: —

Oh, Neptune, thou mayest save me if thou wilt; thou mayest sink me if thou wilt; but whatever may befall I shall hold my tiller true.

As we look at this correspondence and see how Lincoln was criticised by able men on a point where the judgment

of events and of history alike has gone wholly in his favor, is it not well for us, before passing hasty judgment and indulging in quick condemnation, to reflect that the men charged with great public duties may have a knowledge of conditions and possess sources of information which are not known to the world, or even to those who criticise? Both for men in public life, and for those who criticise these men, I think this correspondence contains many lessons in conduct and character which, if taken to heart, will make the public service better and the judgment of the onlooker less hasty.

This thought and the admonition which these glimpses of the past bring to us have been put into noble verse by a poet¹ of our own day, and it is to the poet that we must always turn for the best expression of what we try to say with the faltering words of prose.

A flying word from here and there,
Had sown the name at which we sneered,
But soon the name was everywhere,
To be reviled and then revered :
A presence to be loved and feared,
We cannot hide it or deny
That we, the gentlemen who jeered,
May be forgotten by and by.

Consider, also, the result. Lincoln's paramount purpose was to save the Union, and he saved it. His critics thought he was sacrificing the anti-slavery cause. He thought otherwise, and he was right. At the accepted time he emancipated the slaves and signed the death warrant of human slavery. Had he struck at the wrong moment he might have ruined the Union cause and thereby left the slaves in bondage. He was a great statesman,

¹ Edwin Arlington Robinson.

and he knew all the conditions, not merely a part of them. He therefore succeeded where his critics would have failed.

Turn now from the difficulties and the criticisms with which Lincoln contended upon his own side, and which surrounded him like a network, through which he had to cut or break his way as best he might, and look with me for a moment at the force with which he was doing battle, and see whether we can also find a lesson there. Lincoln's purpose was to save the Union; the object of those with whom he fought was to destroy it. I am not going to waste time upon that emptiest of all questions, whether the states had the right, under the Constitution, to secede. The purpose of the Constitution, if it had meaning or purpose, was to make a nation out of jarring states, and that it had succeeded in doing so was stated by Webster, once and for all, when he replied to Hayne in the greatest speech ever made in the Senate. Secession was the destruction of the Union, whether the Constitution provided for such a contradiction as the right of secession or not. Secession was revolution, and revolution is not to be stopped or to be provided for by paper constitutions. This particular revolution, however, found its reason and its excuse in the doctrine of state rights. Under cover of maintaining the rights of states the Union was to be destroyed. On this issue the war was fought out. The Union was victorious, and the rights of states emerged from the conflict beaten and discredited. The result brought with it a new danger in the direction of a disproportionate growth in the power of the central government, and this peril the fanatics of state rights, and no one else, had brought upon themselves and upon the country. In the first public speech which I ever delivered, some thirty years ago, alas, I said: —

. . . The principle of state rights is as vital and essential as the national principle itself. If the former, carried to extremes, means anarchy, the latter, carried to like extremes, means centralization and despotism. . . .

Two lessons are clearly written on the pages which record the strife between the inborn love of local independence and the broader spirit of nationality created by the Constitution. One is reverence for the Constitution; the other, a careful maintenance of the principle of state rights.

To these general views I have always adhered, and I repeat them now because I do not wish to be misunderstood in what I am about to say in regard to state rights at the present time. The subject is one of deep importance and ought never to be neglected. The growth in power of the central government is inevitable, because it goes hand in hand with the growth of the country. There is no danger that this movement will be too slow; there is danger that it will be too rapid and too extensive. The strength of our American system resides in the fact that we have a Union of states, that we are neither a weak and chaotic confederation, nor one highly centralized government. It is of the highest importance that the states should be maintained in all their proper rights and the Constitution scrupulously observed; but when the Constitution is thrust forward every day, on every occasion, serious and trivial alike, whether applicable or inapplicable, and for mere purposes of obstruction, the government of the Union is not injured, but the Constitution is brought into contempt, and the profound respect which we all should feel for that great instrument is impaired. In the same way the rights of the states, the true rights, are again in danger at this time, not from those who would trench upon them, but from those who abuse them, as did

the advocates of secession. Nothing can accelerate the growth of the national power to an unwholesome degree so much as the failure of the states, from local or selfish motives, to do their part in the promotion of measures which the good of the whole people, without respect to state lines, demands. No such reproach, so far as I am aware, lies at the door of Massachusetts. The President of the United States has said, not once but many times, that if every state had adopted corporation and railroad laws like those of Massachusetts, there would have been no need of much of that national railroad legislation which he has advised and which has been largely enacted. He has also said, in regard to our laws relating to health, that if every state had the same system, there would have been but little need of the pure food act. There are other states which have a record like that of Massachusetts in these directions, but there are many which have not. The result of this neglect, and of local selfishness, has been national legislation and a great extension of the national power, brought on directly either by the failure of the states to act, or by thrusting state interests and state rights across the path of progress.

Take another and far more serious phase of this same question. We can deal with foreign nations only through the United States. By the Constitution a treaty is the supreme law of the land. No state can make a treaty, and yet a treaty is worthless if any state in the Union can disregard it at pleasure. The people of the United States will not long suffer their foreign relations to be imperiled, or permit the peace of the country to be put in jeopardy, because some one state does not choose to submit to the action of the general government in a matter with which the general government alone can deal. They will

not permit a legislature or a city council to disregard treaties and endanger our relations with other countries. Those who force state rights into our foreign relations will eventually bring on a situation from which those rights will emerge as broken and discredited as they did from the Civil War. They were the enemy, powerful in their influence upon the minds of men, with which Lincoln grappled, and which he finally overthrew. The danger to the rights of states does not arise now, any more than it did in 1861, from the incursions of the national government, but from the follies of those who try to use them as a cover for resistance to the general government in the execution of the duties committed to it. Congress alone can declare war. The President and the Senate alone can make peace. It is not to be tolerated that one or two states shall assert the power to force the country into war to gratify their own prejudices. Their rights will be protected by the general government sedulously and fearlessly, but if they venture to usurp or to deride the national authority they will be forced to yield to the power of the Union, and the state rights which they have wrongly invoked, and their indifference to the interests of the nation, will meet the punishment they deserve. The day has passed when one state, or a few states, could interfere with the government of the Union in its own field. Lincoln smote down that baleful theory when he crushed secession and saved the Union. But if we are wise, it is to the states themselves that we ought to look for the preservation of the rights of the states, which are so essential to our system of government, and the states can preserve their rights only by doing their duty individually in regard to measures with which the welfare of the people of all the states is bound up, and by not

seeking to thwart the general government in the performance of the high functions intrusted to it by the Constitution. If the advocates of the extreme doctrines of state rights use them, not for the protection of local self-government, but to promote selfish interests hostile to the general welfare, or still more to embarrass and paralyze the national government in the performance of the duties for which it was created, the people will not endure it, and state rights will be unduly weakened if not swept away, — a result greatly to be deplored.

In the Civil War the fighting champions of state rights bound them up with the cause of slavery, which was not only an evil and a wrong, but which was a gross anachronism, — a stumbling-block to the onward march of the Republic. They and their allies, the copperheads, the Southern sympathizers, and the timid commercialism of the North, proclaimed that they were conservatives, and denounced Lincoln as a revolutionist. “Radical,” “black Republican,” “tyrant,” were among the mildest of the epithets they heaped upon him. Yet the reality was the exact reverse of this. Lincoln was the true conservative, and he gave his life to preserve and construct, not to change and destroy.

The men who sought to rend the Union asunder in order to shelter slavery beneath state rights, the reactionaries who set themselves against the march of human liberty, were the real revolutionists. Lincoln’s policy was to secure progress and right by the limitation and extinction of slavery, but his mission was to preserve and maintain the Union. He sought to save and to create, not to destroy; and yet he wrought at the same time the greatest reform ever accomplished in the history of the nation. Let us learn from him that reaction is not conservatism, and

that violent change and the abandonment of the traditions and the principles which have made us great is not progress, but revolution and confusion.

One word upon one other text and I have done. In August, 1864, Lincoln one morning asked his Cabinet to sign their names on the back of a sealed and folded paper. After the election, in the following November, he opened the paper in the presence of his Cabinet, and these words were found written therein:—

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Aug. 23, 1864.

This morning, as for some days past, it seems exceedingly probable that this administration will not be reelected. Then it will be my duty to so coöperate with the President elect as to save the Union between the election and the inauguration, as he will have secured his election on such ground that he cannot possibly save it afterward.

A. LINCOLN.

Was there ever a nobler patriotism shown by any man than is contained in those few lines? What utter forgetfulness of self, what devotion to the country do they reveal! Then, as at the beginning, we see him driving straight forward to his one mighty purpose,—the salvation of the Union. No criticism, no personal or party defeat, nothing could change that great intent. There, indeed, is a lesson to be learned and to be repeated from day to day. We none of us can be an Abraham Lincoln, but we all can try to follow in his footsteps. If we do so the country will rise to ever new heights, as he would fain have had it.

That nation has not lived in vain which has given to the world Washington and Lincoln, the best great men and the greatest good men whom history can show. But

if we content ourselves with eulogy and neglect the teaching of their lives, we are unworthy of the heritage they have left us. To us they offer lofty ideals, to which we may not, perhaps cannot, attain, but it is only by aiming at ideals which are never reached that the great victories on earth are won. Yet when all is said, it is not Lincoln's patient wisdom, his undaunted courage, his large abilities that should really sink deepest into our hearts and minds to-day. Touch, if you can, as he touched, the "mystic chords of memory." Think of that noble character, that unwearied devotion to his country, that gentle heart which went out in sympathy to all his people. No one can recall all this and not feel that he is lifted up and made better. Remember him as he lay dying, having offered up the last great sacrifice on the altar of his country. Then, indeed, you feel his greatness, and you cry out, in the words of Bunyan :—

So Valiant-for-Truth passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE TARIFF.

FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE SENATE,
JUNE 19, 1909.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE TARIFF.

MR. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to close, and I have a few words, not directly connected with the duty on hides, which I wish to say before I take my seat.

To the best of my ability I have tried to state the case for these great leather industries, which extend into almost every part of the Union, and which are so important, not only to those engaged in them, but to the great body of the American people who use and consume their product. Yet, despite the fact of the wide dispersion of these industries, I am fully aware that to my part of the country, and particularly to my own state, they are of especial moment. It would be hypocrisy to say that I am not influenced by the interests of my state and of New England. I not only am, but I should be unworthy to sit here if I were not profoundly interested in all that concerns the welfare of Massachusetts. I may add that I have not observed, in an experience of five tariff revisions, that any Representative or Senator was insensible to the wishes and hopes of his own state. Each one of us endeavors to do all that he possibly and honestly can for the interests of the people whom he immediately represents. He would be unfit for his trust if he did not do so. At the same time I have endeavored in all my dealings with the tariff to give to every part of the country the same consideration which I demanded for my own. In every tariff

bill for which I have voted, and in this bill, for which I intend to vote, there are many items which I should oppose if I were willing to govern myself solely by local or selfish motives; but I have always felt that if we were to have protection it must be given to every industry which could show a fair title to encouragement, and that if we were to have a free-trade tariff it must be free trade for everybody. In that specious and elastic formula of a "tariff for revenue only," which in essence means the protection you want for your own industry and free trade for your neighbor whose products you buy, I have neither belief nor sympathy. The one tariff which is certainly wrong and bad is the tariff which gives free trade to one man and protection to another, when both are equally entitled either to protection or to free trade. Therefore, Mr. President, in view of my consistent attitude on this question, in view of the many votes which I have given and which I shall shortly give on tariff questions, I think I may say that, although I am wedded to the interests of my state, I endeavor not to be unduly biased by them to the injury of any other state. I certainly am not so biased in the position I have taken in regard to hides, as I have repeatedly said.

In the course of the discussion aroused by this revision of the tariff, a good deal has been said about New England; some attacks have been made upon that portion of our common country, and it has been charged that she has had an undue influence in tariff legislation. The rule of seniority has always been wisely and pretty strictly applied in the Senate of the United States, and if of the seven senators longest in the service five are from New England, that is merely an evidence of her good fortune, to which all other sections of the country can attain if

they follow her example. I am proud to say that New England has always had a large influence in the legislation and the administration of the Government of the United States, but that that influence has been undue or improper, or has been willfully exercised to the injury of any other section of the country, I wholly deny. We of New England know that the welfare of California, the development of her industries, and the exclusion of Asiatic competition from her coast, are as important to us as they are to her, and to all that great and noble region of our country. We know that the prosperity of Kansas and Nebraska, and of all the great wheat-raising and corn-growing states of the West, is vital to our own well-being. We feel more keenly, perhaps, than any other part of the country the importance of steady and widespread prosperity throughout the South, for on her great staple our largest industry depends. We have long since learned the lesson that our own prosperity is indissolubly bound up with that of all parts of our common country. All we ask is that the same feeling should be returned to us, and that our brethren of the other states should realize that in the East and in New England they find their best market, their best customers, and a great deal of the capital which they need for their own development. Our New England States are old in settlement and small in area, but voting is done by men and not by acres. We have forty-one electoral votes, which could ill be spared either by the Republican party or the cause of protection. We do not differ in our interests, our population, or our industries from the Middle Atlantic States. New York has thirty-nine electoral votes, New Jersey has twelve, Pennsylvania has thirty-four, and Delaware has three. It is needless to say that west of New York are also great in-

dustrial and manufacturing states reaching to the Mississippi and beyond, and presenting large areas made prosperous by industries vitally concerned in the maintenance of the protective tariff. But to those ten Eastern states which I have mentioned, and which are nearly identical in interest, I would call especial attention as an example. They are old in settlement, I repeat, small in area compared to the rest of the country, but they cast 129 electoral votes; too large a number to be overlooked, too important in deciding the fate of government and parties to be lightly accused of undue influence. Nor are the Eastern states retrograding in population. At each of the last censuses Massachusetts gained a Congressman, and the same is true of Pennsylvania and New York.

MR. KEAN. And New Jersey, also.

MR. LODGE. And New Jersey.

There are a good many states in the Union, and some of them much younger than we are, which cannot furnish this proof of steady and healthy growth.

We recognize the enormous debt we owe to the Union of states, but I do not think that we have ever shrunk from bearing our part of the burdens of the nation. Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill are our enduring monuments of the Revolution. In the hours of the darkest trial Massachusetts sent more than her quota — over one hundred and fifty thousand men — into the armies of the Union. We had no slaves to leave behind to carry on the work of the community, and yet that work went steadily forward all through the days of war, although one man of military age in every two went to the front. I do not mention this to arrogate to my state any peculiar distinction in patriotism, but merely to show that we have always

been ready to do our share and more than our share when the country called upon us. Our states of New England are small in area and rich in natural beauty, but poor in natural wealth. We have no minerals, no vast tracts of fertile land. We have a severe climate, and the possibilities of our agriculture are limited by our northern temperature. Except for the power of our rivers and the forests of Maine, nature has conferred upon us no gifts which in themselves mean wealth and ease and prosperity. The one thing due to nature, which cannot be taken from us by more favored regions, is our seacoast with its harbors. From the sea the New England colonies drew their wealth. Starting with the fisheries, the New England whalers, merchants, and sea captains pushed their commerce and bore their flag into every quarter of the globe. The embargoes, non-intercourse acts, and the war of 1812 fell with crushing effect upon New England, and drove her seamen from the deck and the wharf to the farm and the factory. Despite all this, the tariff of 1816, carried under the leadership of Calhoun and the brilliant group of men who had come into Congress from the South and West before the war, found New England still a commercial community, in the main a seafaring people, chiefly dependent on foreign trade and adverse to protective duties. Daniel Webster spoke against those duties, but the protective policy founded by Hamilton was too strong to be resisted, and New England adapted herself to the new policies which she had not forced upon the country, as she had already done to her hard natural conditions, and Webster became the great champion of protection.

In 1828, when the famous tariff bill of that year was before the Senate, Mr. Webster made a speech explaining his change of position. He said :—

New England, sir, has not been a leader in this policy. On the contrary, she held back herself and tried to hold others back from it, from the adoption of the Constitution to 1824. Up to 1824 she was accused of sinister and selfish designs, *because she discountenanced the progress of this policy*. . . . Under this angry denunciation against her the act of 1824 passed. Now the imputation is of a precisely opposite character. . . . Both charges, sir, are equally without the slightest foundation. The opinion of New England up to 1824 was founded in the conviction that, on the whole, it was wisest and best, both for herself and others, that manufactures should make haste slowly. . . . When, at the commencement of the late war, duties were doubled, we were told that we should find a mitigation of the weight of taxation in the new aid and succor which would thus be afforded to our own manufacturing labor. Like arguments were urged, and prevailed, but not by the aid of New England votes, when the tariff was afterwards arranged at the close of the war in 1816. Finally, after a winter's deliberation, the act of 1824 received the sanction of both Houses of Congress and settled the policy of the country. What, then, was New England to do? Was she to hold out forever against the course of the government, and see herself losing on one side, and yet make no effort to sustain herself on the other? No, sir. Nothing was left to New England but to conform herself to the will of others. Nothing was left to her but to consider that the government had fixed and determined its own policy; and that policy was *protection*. I believe, sir, almost every man from New England who voted against the law of 1824 declared that if, notwithstanding his opposition to that law, it should still pass, there would be no alternative but to consider the course and policy of the government as then settled and fixed, and to act accordingly. The law did pass; and a vast increase of investment in manufacturing establishments was the consequence.

I can add nothing to that lucid statement of the foun-

dation of our protective policy and of the attitude of New England in regard to it.

There was one law and one policy for the whole country. Every state could avail itself of it. New England made the best of the situation. That was all, and it does not become those who declined to take advantage of what was common to all to censure New England for doing so. That protective policy has continued with fluctuations, but always protective down to the present time. The only industry to which protection has never been extended is that of the shipowner, which was peculiarly a New England interest in the old days, and owing to our refusal to protect that industry it has now disappeared from the face of the waters. Driven from the ocean, we of New England deserve praise, not blame, that we have turned with undiminished courage to a new scene and won prosperity on the land.

Thus shut out from her natural element, the whole energy of New England went into manufactures, and we have built up great industries and made populous and thriving states. The state I represent in part is, with four exceptions, the smallest in the Union. Fifth from the bottom of the list in area, we are seventh in population. Fifth from the bottom of the list in area, we are first in cotton textiles and in boots and shoes. We are one of the great woolen-making states. In 1905 our manufacturing production was over a billion dollars in value, and of that billion dollars small industries, with capital averaging not over a million dollars, produced in the aggregate over three hundred millions. With the exception of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, there is no state which has such a variety of industries. Four years ago there were over four hundred and eighty-

eight thousand people employed in our industries, as operatives, which means, probably, at least a million and a half who drew their living directly from the wages paid; while of the remaining million and a half or more of our population, a very large proportion were directly or indirectly supported and sustained by the industries of the state. We paid out two hundred and seventy-two millions in wages and salaries in 1905. The capital invested was nine hundred and sixty-five million; the number of establishments nearly eleven thousand; the value of the stock six hundred and twenty million; and the value of the goods one billion one hundred and twenty-four millions. These Massachusetts operatives and workingmen and women have put over seven hundred millions into the savings banks of the state. It is all their money, for the average deposit is only \$125, and the law prevents a larger deposit than \$1000 by any one person. It is their hard-earned money which has gone out to help in the building of railroads and the construction of public improvements in the newer states.

Do you not think that it is in the common interest of the entire Union that the wages of these thrifty, hard-working people should be maintained, and that their opportunities of employment should be enlarged and not diminished? In my own lifetime I have seen the city of Lynn at my own doors grow from a country town into a thriving city of eighty thousand people, built up on this single industry of boots and shoes, of which she sends annually millions into the markets of the world. I have seen Brockton and Haverhill become great centres of the same industry, and cities rise where villages stood before. Salem, once the home of the East India trade, whose ships clove the waters of every sea, deprived of her commerce has found a new

life and a new prosperity in the leather industries, which now fill her streets with an active, growing population, who rejoice in her traditions, preserve the beautiful old houses of her merchants, and hold as consecrated the places which were touched and immortalized by the genius of Hawthorne. Far from coal and iron mines, Worcester has risen to be a great city, and is to-day one of the centres of the metal industry. New Bedford, built up by whaling, and whose hardy seamen, penetrating in pursuit of their prey to the frozen regions of the poles, drew forth the eloquence of Edmund Burke, turned from the sea where a harvest could no longer be gathered, and has become one of the leaders in making cotton goods. Fall River and Lowell and Lawrence are the great exemplars of what has been done in cotton and woolen textiles — a vast industry whose factories are scattered throughout the state. Holyoke and Springfield, strong and prosperous, have found their success in making paper; and I might go on with a list of industries which would reach into every corner of the state and which, starting with the fishermen of Gloucester and Provincetown, would extend to the paper makers of Dalton and the cotton spinners of North Adams, and would cover in its course almost all the important industries in which civilized man engages. I should be something worse than insensible if I did not feel a great and honest pride in such a record of achievement by the people of my state — the state of my birth, where I have lived all my life, where my kindred have lived before me from 1630 onward, and from which I hope never to be separated whether living or dead.

But I do not speak of these things in order to boast of that in which I feel a just pride. I use Massachusetts only as an example of New England and the East. We

have won prosperity, and we have won it through no chance gifts of Mother Earth, but solely by the brains and the energy, the intelligence, courage, tenacity, and education of our people,—the naturalized and the adopted as well as the native born. We have not snarled or grumbled at the prosperity of any of the other states. We have not sought to injure or destroy the success of other Americans anywhere. We have rejoiced in it. We have been content to do the best we could under the conditions imposed by nature and by the legislation of the United States, and we have succeeded and achieved a hard-won prosperity. Under the economic policies which the Government of the United States has adopted we have built up our industries and added thereby to the capital, the wealth, and the prosperity of the whole country. We do not come *in forma pauperis* to sue for favors, or in the guise of robbers to plunder others for our own benefit. We come to the council table of the nation, to whose upbuilding we have contributed, with a deep consciousness that there is no prosperity worth having which is not part of the nation's prosperity, and we ask only that we should be dealt with according to our merits, and that our great industrial population should receive the same treatment and consideration as that which is accorded to all Americans in all parts of the United States.

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 09929 300 1

